The Nation

FOUNDED 1865

Vol. CXIX NEW YORK, WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 3, 1924 No. 3087

Contents

EDITORIAL PARAGRAPHS 227
EDITORIALS:
- How "Dangerous" Is La Follette?..... 229
- The Helpless Associated Press..... 230
- A Women's Bloc?..... 230
- Yum-Yum! 231

OPIUM AND ENGLAND. By Ellen N. La Motte..... 232
NEW MORALS FOR OLD:
- Communist Puritans. By Louis Fischer..... 235

DIRECT VOTING FOR PRESIDENT. By William Hard..... 236
ENGLAND AND RUSSIA AGREE. By Philip J. Rabinovitch..... 237
IN THE DRIFTWAY. By the Drifter..... 238
CORRESPONDENCE 239
LOOK OUT. By Edgar Lee Masters..... 240
BOOKS:
- The American Manner. By Johan J. Smertenko..... 240
- Artifice. By J. W. Krutch..... 241
- An Amateur at Literature. By William A. Drake..... 241
- Down to the Sea in Ships. By Oswald Garrison Villard..... 242
- Books in Brief..... 242

INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS SECTION:
- The Anglo-Russian Treaty..... 243
- Russia's Harvest 245

OSWALD GARRISON VILLARD, Editor
Associate Editors
LEWIS S. GANNETT
ARTHUR WARNER JOSEPH WOOD KRUTCH
FREDA KIRCHWEY MARK VAN DOREN
Managing Editor Literary Editor
ISABEL LA MONTE, Advertising Manager
Contributing Editors
ANATOLE FRANCE JOHN A. HOBSON NORMAN THOMAS
ROBERT HERRICK H. L. MENCKEN CARL VAN DOREN
LUDWIG LEWISOHN

Subscription Rates: Five dollars per annum postpaid in the United States and Mexico; to Canada, $5.50, and to foreign countries of the Postal Union, $6.00.

THE NATION, 20 Vesey Street, New York City. Cable Address: Nation, New York. Chicago Office: 38 So. Dearborn Street. British Agent for Subscriptions and Advertising: E. Thurtle, M.P., 36, Temple Fortune Hill, N.W. 11, England.

IN A FAIRY STORY, "The Fortress Unvanquishable Except for Sacnoth," Lord Dunsany tells how the all-powerful magician Gaznak long terrorized the people of Allathurion. None dared attack the demon until the brave Leothric, armed with the sword called Sacnoth, penetrated the fortress and with a single whir of the invincible weapon cut off Gaznak's head. Then Leothric looked around him, "and there was no fortress nor sound of dragon or mortal, only beside him lay an old man, wizened and evil and dead." A few weeks ago the Ku Klux Klan had Americans so terrorized that not one of the national political conventions dared even breathe its name. Suddenly Senator La Follette, wielding the sword Common Sense, boldly attacked the Invisible Empire. Mr. Davis followed presently in defying the Klan, and then the irrepressible Mr. Dawes, unwilling that the Republicans should be left virtually as the party of the K. K. K., added a milk-and-water condemnation. Now it is predicted that even Cautious Calvin Coolidge will fearlessly approach the Klan from behind and twist its tail. Having waited, as in the Boston police strike, until majority sentiment showed itself against the Klan, Mr. Coolidge will probably pose as the upholder of "law and order"—the savior of the country. But let it not be forgotten this time whose was the first blow that crumpled the walls of the Invisible Empire.

MEANWHILE OTHER EVENTS are taking place which may bring it about that this Klan, of whose secret power all the political conventions stood in dread a few weeks ago, will have turned into the road toward oblivion by Election Day. The growth of the K. K. K. has been like a rash on the body politic, subsiding suddenly in one place to break out in another. Quackery and commercialism ruined its hold quickly in the Southeastern States, where it first rose to power. But it subsided there only to become virulent in the Southwestern part of the United States and later in the Middle West. Now the Southwest has had enough of it. The victory of ex-Governor Walton, anti-Klan candidate in the Democratic primary for United States Senator in Oklahoma, has been followed by the still more impressive triumph of Mrs. Miriam A. Ferguson in Texas, the fortress of Klanism in the Southwest. "Ma" Ferguson, who won the Democratic nomination for Governor against the Klan candidate by about 100,000 majority, will thus probably become the first woman head of any of our States. *The Nation* has all along advocated free speech and a fair field for the Klan, and has condemned arbitrary action against it. We have been persuaded that its bigotry and buncombe could not long endure; that, if not martyrized, American common sense would presently repudiate it. Such a process now seems to be at work.

NEWSPAPER GARBLING with a view to bolstering the editorial position of the journal in question appeared at its worst in the summary which the New York *Herald Tribune* printed on August 17 of the statement of the Federal Council of Churches in regard to National Defense Day (originally called "Mobilization Day"). The head was:

PUBLIC OPINION RALLIES AROUND DEFENSE DAY
Federal Council of Churches Finds Protests Represent Only a Minority, Its Bulletin Announces
WIDE SUPPORT PLEDGED
Delay in Giving Out Full Order of War Department Declared Unfortunate

Below this head was a short account, giving the impression that the Federal Council of Churches justified National Defense Day, whereas a reading of the organization's statement in full carries just the opposite conviction. The report contains the material used in the newspaper, but the latter has so divorced it from its context that it is wholly misleading—and therefore untrue. The *Herald Tribune* prints a regular feature called "The Truth," in which it says it "will be glad to receive and publish corrections of inaccuracies in its columns." We suggest that it apologize here for its garbled version of the report of the Federal Council of Churches, or else print the document in full.

MOST AMERICANS and many Englishmen thought the Irish question settled by the Anglo-Irish Treaty in 1922. But Ulster and Sinn Fein have not yet agreed to agree. Southern Ireland feels that Ulster's obstreperousness is due to the political machinations of the Unionist Party and the House of Lords; Ulster feels that the Free State has always in mind a united Ireland under the rule of Celtic and Roman Catholic influences. Alternate attempts at a settlement, first by force and then by arbitration, finally culminated in the Anglo-Irish Treaty. Article 12 of that treaty postponed the boundary issue, apparently

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in the hope that time would bring the two parties together. The hoped-for has not happened. According to the provisions of Article 12 a Boundary Commission has been set up, and Great Britain and the Free State have appointed their representatives. Ulster refuses to appoint a commissioner, apparently fearing to lose the provinces of Fermanagh and Tyrone and the city of Londonderry.

IN THIS IMPASSE the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council has ruled that an amendment to the treaty is necessary before Great Britain can act for Northern Ireland. When Parliament convenes it will give first consideration to this question. Already it seems to have aroused all the emotion and bad feeling that Irish problems have always stirred. Conservatives and Liberals who negotiated the treaty are particularly eager that the instrument stand as it is without arousing further the old animosities. They feel, if Mr. Austen Chamberlain can be taken as their spokesman, that Sir James Craig and Mr. Cosgrave should meet and settle the question between themselves. The Boundary Commission would then be used only to ratify their agreement. In the event of failure, the London *Nation* calls it a clear-cut task for the Cabinet to introduce legislation to enable the Boundary Commission to act. The former method seems the preferable because no legislation is going to coerce Ulster and the Free State into cooperation.

ENGLAND LIKES TO BELIEVE, and to publish her belief, that the opium-using populations of her eastern empire are wedded to the habit and to wipe out the traffic would be impossible. Occasional pathetic appeals from native groups tend to throw doubt on the reality of this situation. In her excellent article in this issue of *The Nation* Ellen La Motte describes the futile efforts of members of British Malaya to rid themselves of imported opium. At its meeting in July the All-India Congress Committee adopted an interesting resolution showing how the leaders of Indian opinion feel about that particular "necessary evil."

> In the opinion of the All-India Congress Committee the opium policy of the Government of India is altogether contrary to the moral welfare of the people of India. The Congress Committee is of the further opinion that the people of India would welcome the total abolition of the opium traffic for the purpose of revenue, and is also of the opinion that the production of opium is out of all proportion to the medicinal requirements of India.

As long as British governments wax fat off the revenues from opium, they will manage to find reasons why the drug cannot be abolished. The peoples of the East look to the disinterested influence of the United States eventually to lift this load from their shoulders.

SOMETIMES IT SEEMS as if the Monroe Doctrine exists solely that it may be invoked whenever we want to do something shady in Latin America. Take, for instance, the statement of Albert Strauss of the New York banking house of J. and W. Seligman and Company before the Williamstown Institute of Politics that the Monroe Doctrine obligates us to collect a loan due a foreign government in Latin America in case the debtor is delinquent. The argument, of course, is that otherwise the creditor government has an excuse for taking measures against the debtor, the justice of which we cannot question. But the fact is that we need only to promulgate a fair and common-sense doctrine in regard our own debts in foreign countries to deflate completely such specious argument. Our Government does not collect debts or validate bad investments for its citizens here in the United States. Why should it do so when they invest their money abroad? Neither does our Government collect for foreign states or their nationals in this country. It has never reimbursed Great Britain or the British for money lent to various of our States, and not repaid, nor has it recognized the right of Great Britain to collect by force. We are glad to note that Leo S. Rowe, director general of the Pan-American Union, took sharp issue with Mr. Strauss. But Mr. Rowe himself went astray in suggesting that our Government supervise the loans of our citizens to Latin America. As Oscar T. Crosby, formerly Under Secretary of the Treasury, pointed out, this means meddling with, and an indirect control over, Latin-American nations. The only policy for our Government is that of "Hands off."

IF THERE IS PATHOS in the breaking up of a yacht which has defended the America's Cup, there is more still in the sale and intended dismantling of the famous Herreshoff shipyard at Bristol, R. I. For a cup defender is a butterfly that spreads its wings for a summer and dies; it is built for one highly specialized competition, and that over it is virtually of no further use. But the Herreshoff shipyard is the mother of all the America's Cup defenders since 1893, having sent forth in succession the Vigilant, the Defender, the Columbia, the Reliance, and the Resolute to vanquish the challengers first of Lord Dunraven and then of Sir Thomas Lipton. The passing of the Bristol shipyard means the end of the Herreshoff genius in yacht designing, and seems almost like giving away a leg on the America's Cup itself. The Bristol plant was established in 1864 by John B. Herreshoff, who later took in his brother "Nat." The taciturn "Nat" has been considered as having the greater mechanical ability, but John B. was a magician in modeling even after blindness came upon him a number of years before his death in 1915. The gradual decay of the Herreshoffs' business suggests that the same standardization which rules elsewhere is crowding individuality out of yacht building too. The brothers wanted, it is said, to build a challenger for the America's Cup, which might have proved strikingly different from the Resolute and its predecessors, since challenging for the trophy means constructing a vessel to cross the Atlantic under its own sail. But for a generation the Herreshoffs fashioned such perfect defenders that they spoiled their chance to build a challenger.

WITH THIS ISSUE Mark Van Doren becomes literary editor of *The Nation*, and Joseph Wood Krutch assumes the dramatic editorship, succeeding Ludwig Lewisohn. That valued member of the staff is abroad for a lengthy stay and, therefore, joins the ranks of our contributing editors. We are happy in being able to assure our readers that Mr. Lewisohn's gifted pen will continue to add to their pleasure and enlightenment. Irita Van Doren joins Stuart Sherman in editing the new literary supplement of the New York *Herald Tribune*. It is a happy reflection of the increasing interest in books that the *Herald Tribune* is planning to develop its literary department on a large scale and has placed the management in such competent hands.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

How "Dangerous" Is La Follette?

IF Mr. Dawes did not exist, it is evident that someone like him would have to be created for this campaign. He gives the needed conservative-swashbuckling touch to the battle. He speaks for the type of mind in the National Civic Federation, the society for the preservation unaltered of our Constitution, for our Rotarians and our simon-pure reactionaries of all descriptions. To him La Follette is, of course, the "enemy," and so all the familiar arguments used by the regular Republicans against Roosevelt in 1912 are once more trotted out. La Follette, Mr. Dawes asserts, is launching a "formidable attack" upon the "fundamental principles of our Constitution." He is "leading the army of extreme radicals, has a platform demanding public ownership of railroads and attacking our courts which are a fundamental and constitutional safeguard of American citizenship." His followers are "a heterogeneous collection of those opposing the existing order of things, the greatest section of which, the Socialists, flies the red flag; and into what? Into confusion and conflict of ideas and ideals."

This causes chills to creep up and down the spine of our good but unhappy friend the New York *World,* which sees in it "a declaration of class war" and asserts that "a more dangerous, a more foolish, a more unstatesmanlike speech has not been made in our time." Bless the *World's* sensitive soul! Mr. Dawes has been engaged in nothing else than fomenting class war these several years. Founder of the Minute Men in Chicago, most outspoken and determined upholder of the open shop, advocate of smashing the unions and locking up anybody who dares to believe in any ism except his own—well, what other kind of speech did the *World* think Mr. Dawes would make? Inconsistency has not so far been charged against him, whatever else may be said. He is only running true to form, and if he could prove his charges they would make ammunition from the Republican Party's point of view. If he can "throw a red scare" into the country by denouncing La Follette as a Bolshevik and a near-anarchist, who keeps bad company and is to be known by it, so much the better.

The only difficulty is that the country shows as yet no signs of alarm. The people know, and many regret, that if La Follette is elected he will no more have a well-disciplined Congress of his own faith behind him than would Mr. Davis or President Coolidge, should they be elected. They know that so far as the courts are concerned they cannot be hobbled unless Congress agrees, and that no fundamental change in the Constitution can be made except by the slow and weary process of amendment. The people are aware that Senator La Follette suggests nothing as to the courts more radical than the recall of decisions, once advocated by Theodore Roosevelt. Moreover, it is not likely that the multitude will find their hair standing on end at the prospect of government ownership of railroads—if and when Congress can be won to it—in view of the fact that our northern neighbor, Canada, is steadily moving in that direction by increasing the mileage of its government-owned railroads. Mr. Dawes will, therefore, do well to dwell upon some other of the "dangerous" features of La Follette's candidacy if he would cause his listeners to have gooseflesh. Let him dwell upon the dangers of a political-labor movement, holding up as an example the administration of Ramsay MacDonald in England (but here he must carefully omit to point out that it is this same Labor Government which has made the Dawes plan possible in Europe). If we must have scarecrows, Mr. Dawes ought to give us some with the power to frighten.

But another handicap is the fact that by no means all of La Follette's supporters are Socialists or radicals. As to that we have some expert testimony from the lips of no less an ally and supporter of Mr. Dawes than Nicholas Murray Butler. Upon returning lately from a six weeks' trip to California, he declared in an interview in the New York *Evening Post:* "You would be surprised at the number of people who say they are going to vote for La Follette. I don't mean people of extreme radical type like the I.W.W.'s, but those who could be described as solid and substantial." They were, he added, people who had become convinced that neither of the old parties was serving the interests of the country. Hence, they were determined to try a new deal. These "solid and substantial" people are not going to be frightened by Mr. Dawes's scarecrows. A good many of them are going to say frankly that even if it is true that La Follette has as radically dangerous ideas as Mr. Dawes believes, they will chance them in order to put into the White House a man of such shining personal honesty as the Senator from Wisconsin. They know that this cry of dangerous radicalism, plus charges of sedition and treason, has been brought against Senator La Follette in his own State, and that his fellow-citizens there have four times sent him to the Senate, the last time with a majority of 375,000. No, we are not afraid that Mr. Dawes's attacks upon Senator La Follette will seriously foment class hatred or increase the various brands of sectional distrust we now have. We feel that such opposition honors Senator La Follette and that the attacks will react in his favor.

The attention that Mr. Dawes is paying to the La Follette-Wheeler ticket is proof of the strides that ticket is making. Many Republican politicians and newspapers are indifferent to Mr. Davis, but are whetting their knives for La Follette. They know that he is the candidate to be feared, though he has no organization, no machine, few leaders to help him, and next to no money. Without preparation, his campaign is progressing much as did that of the British Labor Party in England last fall. Its supporters have their hearts in it; there are no paid machine hacks among them. Before us lies a printed "political bulletin" of the National Republican League. We read:

> Republicans must learn from experience to meet the campaign attacks of the radicals or suffer defeat. To guide us we have the experiences of Republican candidates who were defeated in Republican States by radical forces, and of Republican workers in those sections. From these we learn many interesting things. The radicals have frequent meetings, and in many instances keep themselves personally poor by giving money with the zeal of crusaders to their cause.

Precisely that zeal of the crusader is giving the Republicans their fear of the La Follette forces. They and the Democrats have not one thing new or hopeful or constructive to offer. It is but the old stupid choice of Tweedledum and Tweedledee. The La Follette ticket alone points the way to a wiser and nobler America.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Helpless Associated Press

UNDER the by-laws of the Associated Press any member may exercise the right to protest against the admission of any other newspaper owner who publishes in his immediate territory, and that protest is final unless overridden by a vote of four-fifths of the entire membership. No feature of the organization of the Associated Press has drawn more fire than this. It has led to suggestions that all news associations be compelled by law to supply their service to any applicant and to charges that the object of this particular by-law was to build up local news monopolies and make the service of ever greater cash value to the fortunate holder. As other news services have arisen, the charge of seeking monopolistic control hardly lies; none the less this by-law constitutes a great weakness of the Associated Press, renders it subject to just criticism, and is actually hindering its own development.

This last fact has been demonstrated anew by a ballot taken in the hope of overriding the protest rights in Baltimore and Rochester—a ballot taken by mail after a three months' argument for and against the contenders for election. Nothing like this contest has, we believe, ever happened before in the history of the Associated Press. The defender and upholder of the sacred protest right was, comically enough, William R. Hearst. The applicants were high-grade newspaper men, the publishers of the Baltimore *Evening Sun* and of the Rochester *Times-Union*. Ordinarily any news service would be only too pleased to enrol among its users newspapers of this fine quality, but Mr. Hearst was, and is, the dog in the manger. He refuses to yield to his rivals in these two cities, and the selfishness and shortsightedness of a minority of the membership of what ought to be an enlightened institution upheld him. Of 900 votes cast in the Baltimore fight 565 favored the admission of the *Evening Sun* and 335 upheld Mr. Hearst. In the Rochester case the vote was 500 for the admission of the *Times-Union* to 340 opposed. Since these majorities were not sufficient, Mr. Hearst won.

Now the joke of all this is that this William R. Hearst is the same William R. Hearst who was convicted in 1917-1918 by one court after another of wholesale cheating and of stealing from the Associated Press which he as a member was in duty bound to protect and respect. The evidence laboriously compiled by the Associated Press under the personal direction of Melville E. Stone showed that Mr. Hearst had for years been pirating the news for the benefit of his own news service which he was building up as a rival to the Associated Press. It was confidently expected, after the Supreme Court handed down its decision establishing the vital principle that news may be owned in America by those originating it, that Mr. Hearst would be dropped from membership as unfit for continued association with the organization which he had done his best to injure and from which he had stolen deliberately. But its directors had neither the courage nor the sagacity to take this radical step. Mr. Hearst has since gone on buying newspapers with Associated Press memberships, so that he is today more than ever intrenched within the association.

Of course the Hearst employees who carried on the fight were jubilant, and their comment upon it was characteristically materialistic. They felt that all the members ought to rejoice, "because the decisive result increases the value of their memberships." What is worrying the more thoughtful members, however, is the fact that in the cities of Baltimore and Rochester the news furnished to the Associated Press from those cities is supplied to the entire Associated Press membership only by Mr. Hearst, owner and promoter of a competing news service. It is no wonder that the Associated Press directors voted 14 to 1 in favor of the two applicants. The directors are in a ridiculous position; and all because they had not the moral courage to expel this man when they had caught him in flagrant dereliction. As for Mr. Hearst, he must be laughing in his sleeve if he is not laughing out loud.

This is an untenable position for the Associated Press, and it cannot fail to have far-reaching consequences if determined efforts are not made to change the by-law. For that regulation there doubtless was good reason in the early days of the association; it has protected newspaper owners from the founding of "strike" newspapers—newspapers founded to be bought, as a sort of blackmail. But the issue raised in the Baltimore and Rochester cases is of far greater importance to the welfare of the Associated Press than these considerations. Somehow or other a way out must be found if the Associated Press is not to suffer seriously both within its ranks and in public esteem.

A Women's Bloc?

WITH a sure instinct the National Woman's Party invariably challenges public attention and climbs to the top of the first page of the newspapers. Its latest step is to repudiate all men in politics and to come out for a women's bloc in Congress. It will "do its utmost to elect all women nominees, irrespective of their political affiliations, who seem qualified to sit in Congress and who will support the equal-rights amendment and a general feminist program."

This is good publicity; but we doubt whether it is good politics. The Woman's Party has always consistently followed the policy of supporting one issue at a time. It supported suffrage, and suffrage only, until women had the vote; now it is supporting an equal-rights amendment, and will help to elect only one breed of candidate: women who will support that amendment. But votes are needed for the success of such a program, and the Woman's Party asks the voters of the country to forget too many unforgettable facts. Even the women voters are more than women in these days: they are citizens, many of whom have felt the edge of hunger and the burden of economic injustice; they are workers, farmers, housekeepers, not only females and voters. Can the Woman's Party expect these people to support a Republican candidate because she happens to be pledged to the equal-rights amendment? Can they even ask the women supporters of Mr. Coolidge and Mr. Dawes to vote for a woman running on La Follette's ticket?

Before women had the vote it was possible to argue that all issues must stand aside and wait for the granting of that primary right. But once the vote was won, women walked into the field, their new weapon in hand, ready to fall upon any enemy that happened to look inviting. A large number of the more conservative suffragists found themselves in the League of Women Voters, a nonpartisan body devoted to women's interests and interests deeply touching women—chiefly welfare measures, various reform projects, and peace. This organization avoids violently

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

controversial questions like birth control. It opposes the "whole-hog" feministic policy of the Woman's Party. It takes no stand on general economic issues. It has no policy for or against women in office; it works through the men and the existing parties. It has done much good work, but its caution and political aloofness will prevent it from ever becoming a fighting force.

The Woman's Party on the other hand has remained militant. It is not interested in anything but equality for women. It ignores social and political problems which do not touch its immediate program. It took no cognizance of the industrial problem until it stubbed its toe on the question of welfare legislation—endangered or doomed by the Woman's Party amendment—and then it boldly kicked the impediment out of the way, saying: "If equality means wiping out social legislation affecting women, let the legislation go, and good riddance to it." It hopes that it can keep the attention of voting women as steadily fixed on one object as it could that of disfranchised women. We believe that this is impossible; women are going to vote according to the dictates of class interest and personal interest as well as sex interest. There are other revolutions going on in the world besides the women's revolution.

But we agree none the less that no party, left to itself, will allow women an equal chance. Neither labor nor the farmer nor the business man nor the banker is ready to assume executive and political ability in women. They will steadily, perhaps instinctively, resist any such belief. They will accede to women's demands only so far as they wish to please or placate the woman vote. For every party job, for every political office, for every legal change in the direction of equality, women will have to fight as women. Inside the party organizations the women will have to wage their own battle for recognition and equal rights. But the lines will be drawn inside party lines, not across them.

After all, women are an indivisible part of this country's population; they cannot live under a women's Congress and a special set of feminine laws and economic conditions. They, as well as men, suffer when our government is prostituted, and lose their employment when economic hardship sweeps the country. They, like men, have a vote, and like men they will in the long run tend to elect people and parties who represent their whole interest. To be sure, apart from men, they have a special group interest. The Woman's Party amendment is at the moment the one active national expression of that interest. But, whether it is a good amendment or not, it will never be won by asking women voters to forget they are also human beings.

There is no doubt that a large body of active feminist support will swing to the Progressive ticket this fall. Before La Follette was nominated a "Woman's Committee for Political Action" was working for a new political line-up. For the purposes of the campaign these women have merged with the La Follette organization, but they intend to maintain a separate ultimate identity within the progressive movement until equal representation for women is won. They want women to run for office as generally as men, but they would have them run on a platform of general economic progress. They believe that women must be allied with progressivism if they would be free; and that a new party must adopt the cause of women if it would be progressive. It is too early to say whether this particular group will develop power or importance; but some such alliance of active partisan progressivism and feminism appeals to us as the best hope for the women of the country.

Yum-Yum!

HAS the old-fashioned clam-chowder vanished? This is the question which a correspondent puts to the learned editor of the esteemed New York *World*. We read:

> In Manhattan restaurants the "clam chowder" has been short of clams for many years and is nothing more than a vegetable chowder.
>
> Down on Coney Island, where clams ought to be plentiful and cheap, the conditions are even worse. The other day I yearned to feast on a real clam chowder with clams. After trying three places I gave up in despair. The first bowl of chowder contained no clams, but I thought I detected the taste of them. It gave me an appetite and encouraged me to further search. My second bowl was composed largely of potatoes and a chunk of tomato with the usual cracker on the side. It was potato soup pure and simple.
>
> I then repaired to a place which some years ago prided itself on its "famous clam chowder." I asked the waiter whether he had any clam chowder with clams. "Yes, sir," was the ready response. But what he brought me was a vegetable chowder. I asked him where the clams were and he replied: "They're all cooked up." And, strange to say, they left no taste or odor or trace.

Editor-like, the big chief of the *World* prints his correspondent's question, but fails to answer it. So we will. In reply to the mournful query, Has the old-fashioned clam chowder vanished? we answer even more mournfully: "In New York City it never existed." We blush for the palate of the correspondent if he thinks clam chowder can be made merely by the use of clams. Of course it is desirable, as he suggests, that they should be among its ingredients. The tendency nowadays to make clam chowder of dishwater and a pinch of salt is to be deplored from every standpoint except the conservation of our natural resources. But there is another ingredient as essential as clams. Clam chowder should be made *with milk*.

It is the uniform failure to recognize this that leads us to say that clam chowder has never existed in New York City. The Gotham fashion is to serve a water broth, flavored with tomato and bacon, thickened with chopped potato, and—in times gone by—at least garnished with small particles of clam. Now we submit that even in the generous old days when the particles of clam could be tasted, and sometimes observed with a strong glass, this mixture did not constitute clam chowder.

No, the writer of the mournful letter should ship himself somewhere east of Gotham if he would have true clam chowder. We have never sampled the dish in Connecticut or Rhode Island, but we know it is to be had in Boston and other seaports in the State of the Sacred Codfish. There clam chowder consists of thick chunks of clams stewed in rich milk and swimming side by side with slices of potato and onion, the whole seasoned so perfectly that it is impossible to say with what. And in these parts clam chowder has a delectable competitor. It is fish chowder. Made substantially like the other dish, except with generous hunks of haddock or cod in place of clams, this is a chowder fit not merely for kings but even for movie actors, bootleggers, and other multi-millionaires. For a bowl (a plateful would be mere tantalization) of either clam or fish chowder as they make it Way Down East any epicure would walk, hop, or crawl a mile. When we think of it we are prepared to forgive Massachusetts even Calvin Coolidge.

Yum-yum!

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Opium and England

By ELLEN N. LA MOTTE

WHENEVER the opium trade is mentioned one inevitably speaks of England. The two go together, hopelessly intertwined, because for a century and a half England has so closely identified herself with this traffic that there is no way of mentioning the one without of necessity speaking of Great Britain's share in it. The lion's share, unfortunately! A country which stands head and shoulders above all other countries, an outstanding figure in a business which shocks the moral sense of the world! True, other countries have engaged in the opium trade, but not to the same extent, nor are they countries with the same power and prestige. Therefore, however much we may admire Great Britain in many other ways, it is impossible for any one with sincere convictions about the immorality of the opium trade to avoid being called "anti-British." If we are to fight this thing out of existence we shall make no headway by concentrating our attention on the weaker, lesser nations and ignoring the chief offender. And the very moment when the great British Empire frees itself from the stigma which it has deliberately incurred, at that moment will the anti-British argument fall to the ground. But until that happens, we cannot fight opium without mention of its principal upholder.

In the first place, Great Britain has three separate interests in opium. As a producing country, India leads in the world output; as a consuming country, Great Britain has more colonies where opium is eaten and smoked than any other nation; and as a manufacturing country, England plays a great role in the manufacture of morphia, heroin, codeine, which are derivatives of opium. France is a manufacturing country, and permits smoking in her colony of Indo-China; Holland is a manufacturing country, and permits smoking in the Netherlands East Indies; Japan is a manufacturing country, and permits smoking in Formosa. China, Persia, and Turkey are producing and consuming, but not manufacturing countries. The British Empire alone plays all three parts, and has financial stakes of three sorts—as producer, as consumer, and as manufacturer. No other country has more than two forms of direct financial interest; some have only one. It is not surprising, therefore, because of these diverse but extremely lucrative divisions of the trade, that we find Great Britain the chief opponent of its suppression.

Roughly speaking, the world's opium output is as follows:

British India	about	1,500	tons	per	year
Persia	"	162	"	"	"
Turkey	"	250	"	"	"
Balkan States (Serbia, Greece, etc.)	"	157	"	"	"
China (output contraband)	"	?	"	"	"

There is no doubt that China is a very large producer, having backslided since 1917 when poppy cultivation was brought to an end. But China is now betrayed and discouraged. The history of her struggle against opium, continued over a century and a half, is sad reading. Suffice it to say, she now seems to have given up the effort, content to settle down under the tons of morphia being smuggled in to her, discouraged over the open traffic in the foreign concessions, and generally beaten in her futile effort to free herself from this curse. At the present moment it is a favorite argument to point to China's shortcomings as responsible for the world's drug situation, and to say that until China reforms the situation is hopeless. But to expect China to take the lead in opium reform—a country whose sovereignty is reduced to the vanishing-point through foreign aggression, a country that must obtain the consent of a dozen foreign countries for gracious permission to raise her customs dues half a cent—is absurd. This talk about China and her "vast" output smacks of an effort to distract attention from other more powerful and responsible countries. There is, however, no doubt that China's production is very large —the nation today may be likened to a drug addict that has relapsed. The insurgent generals and others raise opium for personal gain and as a means of paying the troops. Little of this opium is exported—it is all consumed within the borders of China. If, however, those European Powers with a strangle-hold on China's finances would allow that hapless country to raise revenues through increased customs dues, China might not have to resort to opium in place of cash. But, no, no protective tariffs to interfere with European trade. And loud complaints on the part of the great Powers that nothing can be done about opium in other parts of the world till China "sets her house in order." Thus the snake swallows its own tail.

Persia, Turkey, and the Balkan states (which produce "Turkish" opium) raise the fine opium used in making morphia and other alkaloids. This output has a distinct value for medicinal use, as the Western world understands that term. On the other hand, Indian opium has no such value, for we are repeatedly told that it is not manufactured into morphia, and is therefore in no way responsible for the morphia and heroin which the drug peddler retails in Europe and the United States. Indian opium, therefore, is a superfluous commodity as far as its medicinal value is concerned, and is produced solely for drugging—for eating or smoking as the case may be. Half of the output is retained in India, where it is sold through thousands of shops licensed by the Government, and eaten in the form of pills. The other half is exported to the "opium-consuming countries" of the Far East—to six or eight British colonies, to the French colony of Indo-China, to the Dutch East Indies, to Portuguese Macao, and to Japanese Formosa. There it is used for smoking. And smoking and eating mean enormous revenue to all these colonial governments. Hence . . .

In India the opium revenue amounts to 3 per cent of the total. But Indian opium, when exported to other countries, yields far richer returns. As a money-getter Indian opium is much more important in the colonies than in the country of its origin. Thus, according to *Foreign Affairs* (London) for November, 1923:

> In reply to Mr. Arthur Ponsonby, who asked Parliament last session for details of the amount of revenue received by various colonies from the sales of opium, the Colonial Secretary supplied these figures:

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

PROPORTION OF REVENUE DERIVED FROM OPIUM

	Per cent
Hongkong	22.4
Straits Settlements	45.5
Federated Malay States	16.8
Sarawak	14.
Ceylon	0.75
Johore	34.25
Kedah	38.3
Perlis	44.3
Kelantan	23.5
Trengganu	37.7
Brunei	14.9
North Borneo	12.3

Apart from this direct revenue opium has another value—it attracts labor. Many of these equatorial colonies depend for their labor supply upon Chinese, Japanese, and other coolies, lured by the prospect of unlimited opium. The general prosperity of certain colonies, the successful working of mines and estates, depends upon imported labor, much of it contract or indentured. Whatever destruction of human life this "prosperity" involves is as nothing when compared to the "prosperity" itself. China's millions can always be drawn upon to replace the waste.

Last autumn one of these British colonies, the Federated Malay States, presented a pathetic little appeal, asking that the opium sales be stopped. As a first step they asked that all the opium smokers be registered and that no new habitués be added, after a certain date, as the old ones died off. In Formosa, Japan is putting down smoking by this system of registration and rationing, and as the mortality among the smokers is heavy—at the rate of four thousand a year—within a few years opium smoking will be wiped out in that country. This petition, presented by 2,000 people in the Federated Malay States, was signed by many opium smokers themselves. They said:

> The opium habit is still sapping the vitality of its votaries in British Malaya . . . wherefore your petitioners pray that your Honor may be pleased to direct that the necessary legislative and departmental steps may be taken to give effect to this gradual total abolition of the opium traffic in the Federated Malay States.

This is the Chief Secretary's reply to this "humble petition," as quoted in the *Far Eastern Times:*

> GENTLEMEN: The subject of your petition is one of extreme difficulty, and will require exhaustive consideration by all the administrations of British Malaya before a final decision can be arrived at as to the best and most practical means of reducing, or, if practicable, abolishing the trade in opium in these countries. I must, therefore, ask you not to look for anything in the nature of a final official reply from me today to the proposals that you have put forward. I propose, however, to mention for your careful consideration some of the most obvious obstacles that occur to me, in the way of giving successful effect, at the present time, to the apparently simple method of gradual abolition of the opium habit advocated in your petition.
>
> (a) In the first place, there is the instinctive objection of the individual to interference by legislation with his personal tastes and habits, for it must be remembered that although you propose to allow all the known opium consumers in the country today to continue to indulge in the habit for the rest of their lives under license, you do not apparently contemplate licensing future immigrants from China who may come to this country with the opium habit already acquired. Of course, if public opinion is sufficiently strongly opposed to any particular personal habit or vice, it is possible that legislative measures may be effective in putting a stop to it; but one has only to look at the difficulties being experienced in America in the matter of alcohol, and the small measure of success that we ourselves can claim in the matter of gambling, to feel grave misgivings on the subject, especially as I think it must be admitted that the general mass of the population in this country is on a lower plane of education and self-discipline than the masses of America.
>
> (b) Then comes the difficulty of the adequate prevention of smuggling. This would require nothing short of an army of officials under present conditions. For prevention to be effective every package, case, parcel, box, or other receptacle coming from China would have to be opened and exhaustively searched, for the smuggling of *chandu* (smoking opium) is a notoriously easy matter. Moreover, this country has a very extensive seaboard, a great deal of which is sparingly populated, and opium running into it would be the easiest thing in the world.
>
> (c) The problem of immigrant Chinese coming into this country with the opium habit has been hinted at. This class constitutes a very considerable proportion of our available labor force, and any policy which resulted in materially checking the inflow of such labor into Malaya would be nothing short of disastrous.
>
> (d) Lastly, we have to consider the very serious obstacle presented by the existing conditions in China in the matter of opium production. Unfortunately, there is abundant evidence that the state of affairs in China in this respect has gone from bad to worse. . . . Until China puts her house in order, we are confronted by the facts of an unlimited supply of illicit opium within easy access of our shores, and of a large proportion of our immigrant laborers coming with the opium habit already acquired, and therefore providing a ready market for smuggled opium, or refusing to come at all to a country where they cannot obtain the drug. . . .
>
> I trust, gentlemen, that you will not suppose that in stating some of the difficulties that have occurred to me, I have any desire to belittle your proposals, or the public spirit which has doubtless actuated you in making them. At the present juncture I can do no more than give you a solemn assurance that your petition will receive the careful consideration at the hands of this Government which the gravity of the problem demands.

This reply is illuminating. Although lost in a waste of pious words, the central idea shines out clearly—the necessity of opium as a bait to secure labor. Dr. Connolly of Singapore, a staunch fighter against opium, has said: "Great numbers of Chinese artisans used no opium when they entered Malaya from China, but contracted the habit under the British flag." As to the loss of personal liberty, which the Chief Secretary mentions in his first paragraph, we must remember that England itself has passed drastic anti-narcotic legislation, for its own protection, yet the freest people in the world seem to have made no outcry with this interference with their "personal tastes and habits." China, of course, is being played up to the hilt. China would put her house in order in a minute if she were allowed to. This petition is now before the Colonial Office, in London.

But people in England are awaking at last. One by one they are becoming aware of this opium traffic, which has been shrouded in secrecy for so many years that today not one English person in a hundred (outside of the official classes) knows that such a thing exists. A significant question was asked in the House of Commons on March 24, 1924. "What," asked Mr. Hannon (a Conservative, be it noted), "is the amount of opium shipped from India to

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Hongkong and to the Straits Settlements in 1923? And what steps are being taken to prevent the smuggling of opium into China?" To which question the Under Secretary of State for India replied:

> The only opium shipped from India to these two colonies is that indented for by their respective governments, which for 1923 amounted for Hongkong to 240 and for the Straits Settlements to 2,100 chests of 140 pounds each (15 and 131 tons, respectively). Moreover, all of it was covered by certificates from the governments of the importing countries, in the form prescribed by the League of Nations, to the effect that the opium was required for legitimate purposes and its importation approved. Opium so consigned to the governments of these colonies cannot be smuggled into China before it has reached the colonies.

Whereupon Mr. Hannon asked: "What are the legitimate purposes embodied in the answer of the honorable gentleman?"

To which no reply seems to have been given.

But here we have a complete exposure of what this "legitimate" use means, and of the sanction of this "legitimate" traffic by the League of Nations. It means the open sale of smoking opium, conducted as government monopolies in these various colonies. It will be remembered that Wellington Koo, in 1921, introduced a resolution before the Council of the League of Nations, asking that opium production be limited to the strict medical needs of the world. At the suggestion of the British delegate, the Assembly of the League changed the wording of this resolution, so that opium was to be produced for medical and *legitimate* needs. These "legitimate" needs supply the revenues we have noted.

Mr. Hannon's question brings out another point—the value of this system of "import and export certificates" indorsed by the League of Nations. All a government has to do is to fill out a certificate, saying that opium is needed for "legitimate" purposes, and the British Government of India honors this permit, and ships out whatever amount of opium is asked for. All these transactions are "legitimate" under the sanction of the League of Nations.

Now the League must not be blamed too harshly for this peculiar situation. After all, what is the League but the nations themselves? And what can the League do if the nations will otherwise? Is England's opium policy within the League likely to be different from her opium policy outside of it? Look at the make-up of the Opium Advisory Committee of the League—every member of that committee represents a country with financial stakes in the opium traffic. And Great Britain, by reason of her triple interest as producer, consumer, and manufacturer, has two delegates instead of one. Is it any wonder that the League has gone on record as sanctioning opium for "legitimate" purposes, and that this vaunted system of certificates for export and import is merely a device to make the thing look handsomer?

Well, things are rapidly reaching a crisis. Public opinion is being mobilized, and the searchlight is being thrown on this opium traffic. The double standard must go. The Western world is determined to protect itself from the dangers of habit-forming drugs, and it will have to extend this same protection to the Orient. There can no longer be discrimination—one lot of people selected for protection, and another lot set apart for exploitation. And if production is allowed for eating and smoking, inevitably the overflow from that output will filter back and overwhelm us, who pretend to a higher civilization. The effect of dangerous drugs is alike upon all individuals, and no one set of people is immune to their consequences. Either opium is good for us all, or bad for us all. We must either allow opium shops in London, Paris, and New York, or we must give to others the same protection that we demand for ourselves.

In November, at the suggestion of Stephen G. Porter, the League of Nations is calling a world conference on opium and allied drugs. Mr. Porter, head of the American delegation which appeared before the Opium Committee last May, laid before that committee the "American proposals," i. e., that the production of opium should be limited to the strict medical needs of the world, and that all other use should be considered an abuse and not legitimate. The one government that hangs back from the full acceptance of these proposals is the British Government. In India, says the British Government, production for domestic use must continue—the eating of opium, a "valued household remedy," must go on. If the greatest producing country, Great Britain, takes this stand, why should not the other producing countries—China, Persia, and Turkey—follow suit? They will have before them the example of the leading Power of the world. If eating opium by the ton is to be considered harmless in India, why is smoking opium by the ton not equally harmless in other countries? Great Britain has a heavy responsibility toward the rest of the world, and her decision in November will mean either victory or defeat in this fight against opium.

It is a pity that this great international conference cannot be held in London instead of Geneva, for what the opium question needs is publicity, and lots of it. Geneva will afford the minimum publicity and London the maximum. If America was calling an international conference of this character, it would be held in New York or Washington, not Pine Bush, Sullivan County, New York. And compared to London, Geneva is Pine Bush.

The opium problem cannot be ended until the British public is aware of the facts. At the present moment the great mass of that public is in ignorance of them, and of the part their Government plays in it. The opium interests fear, and fear rightly, the raising of a great anti-opium sentiment in England. For English opinion is sound. If it once learns the facts, it will react as any honest, sincere people will react, when it knows what this traffic means.

Contributors to This Issue

ELLEN N. LA MOTTE, author of "The Backwash of War" and "The Ethics of Opium," has studied the drug problem in Asia, Europe, and America. She is now in England and will attend the international opium conference at Geneva in November.

LOUIS FISCHER is *The Nation's* Moscow correspondent.

EDGAR LEE MASTERS, author of "Mitch Miller" and "The "Nuptial Flight," novels, is still best known as composer of "The Spoon River Anthology."

JOHAN J. SMERTENKO is a regular reviewer for *The Nation.*

WILLIAM A. DRAKE, formerly managing editor of *Vanity Fair,* is a contributor of verse and literary criticism to various current periodicals. He will edit the review of foreign books for the new literary supplement of the New York *Herald Tribune.*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

New Morals for Old
Communist Puritans

By LOUIS FISCHER

THE Soviet state is omnipotent and omnipresent. Bukharin, the arch-theorist, contends that this is a transitional phase in the development of Communism toward perfection. The Bolsheviks' professed aim is the *reductio ad administratum* of the functions of the state; they would make government the traffic cop of the nation but not the all-pervading busybody and touch-everybody-everywhere which it is now in Russia. The transitional period, however, may last long. In default of a world revolution it may project itself beyond the present generation and even beyond the next. And in the meantime it is good Communist doctrine to maintain an Argus-eyed, Herculanean-clubbed state. The Soviet Government is alike an administrator, politician, statesman, merchant, manufacturer, banker, shipbuilder, newspaper publisher, school-teacher, and preacher.

Such a state is the highest expression of the anti-individualism of socialist philosophy. The single *simian erectus* is nothing; it is the class, the nation which counts.

The citizen lives for the state. Mind and muscle must ever be at its service. A Communist who is a loose liver is an anomaly. There is virtue even in a grain of asceticism and in "morality," not, it is important to note, because luxury and license are sinful and lead to damnation and hell but because the excessive gratification of physical desires, be they for sex or for alcohol, and any over-indulgence of one's selfish mental weaknesses reduce the energy and attention which the individual can offer to the state and to society.

The Bolsheviks do not believe in evolution in the realm of politics; they are revolutionists. Eighteenth and nineteenth-century liberalism tended toward the survival of the fittest. But the essence of the Russian revolution is the protection of the under dog, of the proletarian and peasant who, unaided, would not survive in the unequal struggle with the capitalist and landowner. The function of the Soviet state is to support the oppressed majority against the vested and acquired interests of the economically powerful minority.

The doctrine of the survival of the fittest, translated into every-day life, permits freedom of action, as little restraint as possible, the freest play for nature and human nature. Communist doctrine involves the negation of individual freedom; human nature is discounted in the socialist scale of weights and measures; laissez-faire is replaced by discipline, if need be, by force. Only once did the Communists reveal a liberal vein. It was in their treatment of conscientious objectors during the civil wars. Russia has many sects such as the Dukhobors who are opposed to violence on grounds of conscience. Though the Government was engaged in a death struggle, it respected these sentiments. But in all else, whenever its own interests have been at stake, the state has disregarded the wishes and inclinations of the human unit. Liberty of the individual is not as sacred an ikon as it is in the West. To give economic freedom to the mass is a nobler aim. Thus the Communists would explain and justify (but in my opinion this does not justify) the absence of a free press in Russia and the activities of the G. P. U.

The aim of the Bolsheviks was not merely to overthrow one government and to establish their own. This was a means toward creating a new society. To that extent the Bolsheviks are as presumptuous as most reformers. In 1917 they must have argued to themselves much to this effect: "We are a minority. The majority has not invited us to rule it. But we know better than the majority what is good for it." In the interest of the new society a powerful state was set up. The powerful state was privileged to ride roughshod over the individual. The Bolsheviks presume to tell the individual how to act and how to live. This is the "superiority complex" which is one of the most essential characteristics of puritanism. "I am perfect. Watch me. Go thou and do likewise." The Russian Communists are puritans without religion.

In matters of morals the Communists advocate and agitate but do not use force. Only in the case of members of the Communist Party do they interfere if the individual's actions are likely "directly or indirectly to discredit the party." (Such a phrase permits of the widest interpretation and misinterpretation.) Thus in an article in the *Pravda* on The Party and Personal Life, O. Zortzeva, an official of the Central Control Committee, writes that "not long ago one of the representatives of the Control Committee in the South asked for instructions to combat the evil of divorce." She cites an instance (and there must be many more such instances) where a Communist was required to explain why he left his wife. He replied he could not live with her because she was unfit to mingle in the society of his new friends and acquaintances. The reply was regarded as unsatisfactory. The Soviet state enforces a most liberal divorce law. But the Communists discourage divorce. Within the party it is looked upon with disfavor.

The war, the revolution, the civil wars have worked havoc with the Russian family. It is perhaps no exaggeration to say that family life is crumbling. Trotzky, who has given more active attention to these questions of personal behavior than any other Communist leader, seeks to reinforce the collapsing buttresses of the family. (It will be recalled that Engels, the author with Marx of the "Communist Manifesto," wrote the "Origin of the Family" to prove that the family was a new, unnecessary, and reactionary institution.) Trotzky urges the "communalization of the family household" so as to "disencumber the family of kitchen and laundry." Take the burden of washing, cooking, sewing, child-raising from the family and "the relation between husband and wife will be cleansed of all that is external, foreign, forced, accidental. Each would cease to spoil the life of the other. . . ."

The family life of most Communist leaders would probably find favor in the eyes of the Bishop of New York, and we can imagine that Cotton Mather, if he returned to the flesh and visited Moscow, would hurry to Trotzky, slap him untheologically on the back, and say, "Thou art a man." There was something ascetic and impersonal in the way Lenin used to live. There is something reminiscent of Christian self-abnegation in Chicherin's, Bukharin's, Ra-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

dek's disdain for good clothes. A Communist is required to contribute to the party treasury all the salary he earns above $95 a month. And even if his writings bring him a supplementary income he must not spend it for luxuries. The Communists are the shock troops of the Soviet regime. They must be like athletes in training. They must not consume mental and spiritual ice creams and pastries.

Alexandra Kollontai, now Soviet ambassador in Christiania, stands for the utmost freedom in sexual relations. But a review in the official press of her book, "Love Among Laboring Bees," stigmatizes her views on the subject as "prostitution" and "intellectual tomfoolery." "It is imperative," reads the last sentence of the criticism, "to guard against the harmful influence of Comrade Kollontai." This is the attitude which in other countries leads to the appointment of vice censors. Russia, fortunately, is too advanced to subject itself to such a humiliation. Only the lives of Communists are censored. In respect to the great mass of the people the Bolsheviks content themselves with preaching.

Trotzky's sermons will certainly do the people no harm. Russians have barely a trace of puritanism. Take the instance of their famous, many-ply "mother" oaths. Beside them the worst product of the British navvy looks pale. Says Trotzky: "One would have to consult philologists, linguists, and folk-lore experts to find out whether any other people has such unrestrained, filthy, and disgusting oaths as we have. As far as I know, there is no other." The Communists have initiated an anti-swearing campaign. In some factories the workers themselves decided to fine anyone who used an "expression." Wherever one goes, in industrial plants, in beer saloons, in clubs, one sees the colored "Don't Swear" poster. Even in the army, where curses once found their most fertile field, they are becoming increasingly rare.

A Communist should not play cards. A member of the party will not, if he is a good Communist, enter a gambling casino. (The Moscow gambling casinos, incidentally, have been closed by order of the Government.) Newly initiated Communists ask their instructors whether they are to permit their wives to powder their faces. A Communist would hardly come to her office with her lips rouged and even non-Communist workers in many Soviet commissariats feel that it is bad form to use the lipstick. Certainly very few if any women Communists dress to fashion. Most of them dress badly. There are more serious things to do than to mind the clothes on one's back. It is unworthy of a Communist, and Communists think it is unworthy of all Russians, to give too much thought to the flesh. I know a non-Communist Soviet official who likes to carry a cane, but he leaves it home when he goes to work.

There can be no let-up, says Trotzky, in the war against alcohol. The Government has abolished vodka, but the bootleg "samogonka" has replaced it. The police arrest men and women (in Russia most of the apprehended bootleggers are women) but force removes as little of the evil here as it does in the United States. So strong is the drink tradition in Russia that even many Communists indulge in the permissible wines and light beers. But the party reminds its members that they must inhibit such desires. It will not do for the best soldiers of the state and the master-builders of a new society to become inebriated, or lose their heads and time in the pursuit of women, or play cards, or stop to adjust their neckties while the foundations of the structure are being laid.

Direct Voting for President

(The Nation's *Weekly Washington Letter*)

By WILLIAM HARD

THE La Follette personal presidential platform is for the direct nomination and election of the President.

In the Constitutional Convention of 1787 Gouverneur Morris of New York, representing Pennsylvania, favored electing the President by direct popular vote. He was a citizen of one of the larger States.

It is frequently stated that the Constitutional Convention rejected the idea of a direct popular vote for President because it distrusted the electorate. The debates of the convention, however, show that a distrust of the electorate was a small factor in the matter in comparison with a desire to please the smaller States of the proposed new Union and to dissuade them from believing that the new Union would be dominated by the larger States.

The electoral system as adopted not only protected the smaller States but gave them a distinct advantage. This advantage persists and is the reason why any change to a system of direct popular voting is so difficult.

Nevada chooses three presidential electors—two of them to correspond to the fact that Nevada, like every other State, has two United States senators, and one of them to correspond to the fact that Nevada has one Representative in the lower house of Congress. Nevada at the time of the last census had a population of some 77,000 inhabitants.

New York in the last census had a population of approximately 10,400,000 inhabitants. It chooses two presidential electors for its two United States senators and forty-three presidential electors for its forty-three representatives in the lower house of Congress. It chooses altogether forty-five presidential electors.

Let these figures now be used in calculating the answer to the following question: How many people in Nevada does it take to choose one presidential elector and how many people in New York does it take to choose one presidential elector? The answer will be found to be that twenty-six thousand Nevadans are represented in the electoral college by one elector, while it takes two hundred and thirty thousand New Yorkers to have that same representation.

Or, take a broader calculation, involving a large number of States. Take a calculation involving seventeen States on the one hand and, on the other, the one State of Pennsylvania.

Take the seventeen States of Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Rhode Island, Delaware, Florida, North Dakota, South Dakota, Colorado, Wyoming, Montana, Utah, Idaho, Oregon, Nevada, Arizona, and New Mexico. Together they have a population of 8,762,000.

Pennsylvania has a population of 8,720,000, the figures being those of 1920. Pennsylvania in the electoral college has thirty-eight votes. The other seventeen States, together approximately equaling Pennsylvania in population, arrive in the electoral college with seventy-three votes.

Now let us suppose that all the 8,762,000 people in those seventeen States are earnest progressives. Will they, because of being progressives, be willing to surrender the present system and surrender therefore the advantage in power which they now have over Pennsylvanians?

If this writer were not fearful of being regarded as a

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cynic with a low view of human nature, he would say that the answer is in the negative. As a reporter certainly he is bound to say that the answer to such questions has been in the negative in the past.

Andrew Jackson six times recommended the abolition of the electoral college in messages to Congress. The recommendation was not heeded.

In the seventies of the last century, just before and just after the Hayes-Tilden struggle, numerous proposals were brought into the Congress for abolishing the electoral college and for supplanting it by some new system.

The situation then becomes the following:

There are enough small States to prevent the ratification (by State legislatures) of any constitutional amendment diminishing the presidential power of the small States.

Meanwhile in the House of Representatives there are enough representatives from large States to prevent the adoption by the Congress of any constitutional amendment diminishing the power of the large States.

Finally, as for the idea of disregarding States and districts altogether and of electing a President by a popular majority or plurality, nationally considered and nationally counted, it falls before the fact that our Southern States would negative it. They do not wish to have a presidential power based on the number of their voters. They have disfranchised a considerable percentage of their inhabitants. They now have a presidential power based on inhabitants irrespective of whether those inhabitants are voters or not. They therefore will resist—and successfully resist—every effort to introduce a system in which a count of actual voters would determine the relative power of a State in the choosing of a President.

Putting these facts together, this writer concludes that the only sort of new proposal which could command enough support to be victorious would have to embody at least the two following characteristics:

1. It would have to concede to the Southern States a count of presidential votes not by voters but by inhabitants.

2. It would have to establish some kind of set-off in sacrifice between the small States and the large States.

This would lead to the following proposal:

Let the presidential election be held by congressional districts, which are based not on number of voters but on number of inhabitants, and let each district count one; and let that be all of it.

This would not disturb the South. It would indirectly advantage the large States by taking away from the small States the two excess presidential votes which each of them now has to correspond to its two United States Senators. It would also nevertheless indirectly advantage the small States by taking away from the large States their power to be so "pivotal" in presidential elections—a power which they derive from casting their presidential votes not by districts but in solid State-wide lumps such as twenty-nine from Illinois, thirty-six from Pennsylvania, and forty-five from New York.

The small States would cease to be excessively represented and the large States would cease to be "pivotal" and "decisive."

It would seem to be fair as between the large States and the small States; but, if this were a fair world, it would not be necessary to write this article one hundred and thirty-five years after the adoption of the Constitution.

England and Russia Agree

By PHILIP J. RABINOVITCH

(Mr. Philip J. Rabinovitch, deputy chairman of the Soviet Trade Delegation in Great Britain, participated in the recent Anglo-Russian negotiations and was a member of the special committee that drew up the trade treaty. At the time of the signing of the agreement Mr. Rabinovitch was in this country on a short visit, and The Nation *availed itself of the opportunity to procure from him an exclusive statement on the significance of the treaty and its chance of ratification. The first publication in the United States of the important sections of the treaty itself begins on page 243 of this issue of* The Nation.)

THE deluge of comment in the American press on the signing of the Soviet-British agreement presented a somewhat curious spectacle to one with a European outlook upon things. While it is true that some sober voices were heard in the general chorus, the overwhelming majority of the American periodicals displayed an attitude of uncompromising hostility and wasted precious stores of irony in trying to laugh down an accomplished fact. It was amusing to note with what glee some of the most respectable sheets in American newspaperdom hailed the abortive announcement concerning the disruption of the Soviet-British conference and the breakdown of the negotiations, declaring with an air of finality that no other outcome was possible. When upon the heels of this announcement news came of the signing of the agreement, the same press seized upon the catchword launched by Lloyd George, trying to make of the whole thing a fraudulent "fake" even before the agreement was known here either in broad outline or in detail.

It is hardly believable that in their attitude toward the question of the resumption of normal relations with the Soviet Union the stand-pat newspapers are really voicing popular opinion in America, which cannot but watch attentively the development of the relations between the Soviet Union and Great Britain. The Soviet republics have been accustomed to a similar treatment at the hands of the conservative and reactionary press throughout Europe. But that did not prevent most of the European countries from realizing finally that an existing fact does not cease to exist simply by the virtue of non-recognition, with the result that a constantly increasing number of countries have been entering first into trade relations and then into full normal diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union.

It was not simply a change of heart on the part of the opponents of the Soviet Union which brought about this change in the policy of the Western European Powers, but a realistic economic necessity growing out of the conditions created in Europe since the Treaty of Versailles. The economic rehabilitation of Europe demands the reestablishment of normal relations throughout the Continent, and the Soviet Union is certainly not the least factor in the situation. Those parties and political groups in Europe which did not want to realize this simple truth were finally swept out of office with the result that in many of the European countries power has been gained by the forces of labor which consider the recognition of the Soviet Union as a question of immediate importance. It was for this reason that Premier MacDonald's Cabinet could hardly have afforded to adjourn Parliament for the summer without previously signing the agreement with the Soviet Union. It

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is for this reason, also, that Parliament may be expected finally to ratify it. It is very doubtful whether the opposition parties will present a solid front against the agreement. The Liberal Party is confronted with the alternative of a serious internal split on the question of relations with the Soviet Union. In spite of Lloyd George's remarks his is but a small following in Parliament. The majority of the parliamentary faction of the Liberal Party undoubtedly assumes a more realistic point of view and, like the good business men that they are, they understand that it is better to forget about the old Czarist Government and to take cognizance of the new forces and the new economic relations which have sprung into existence in the Soviet Union. It may even be doubted whether there is complete unity of opinion on this question in the ranks of the Conservative Party, the representatives of which were the most emphatic in their denunciation of the agreement. Some of the Conservative leaders are realistic politicians and it is unlikely that in the present situation they would fling a gauntlet in the face of the labor forces for the sake of pre-war debts, most of which are of a doubtful nature at that.

The timeliness and expediency of the agreement is moreover emphasized by the actual trade relations which have already been carried on between the Soviet Union and Great Britain during the past three years, in spite of all unfavorable circumstances. Small as the scope of these relations may be at present they show a tendency toward rapid development. The Soviet Union is becoming an important factor in supplying British industries with indispensable raw material. The imports of Soviet timber, oil products, grain, flax, etc., into Great Britain are fast growing. On the other hand, the exports from England to the Soviet Union have been increasing constantly in spite of unfavorable conditions in Russia; with the steady improvement which is noticeable in these conditions the imports from England will increase still more. Putting aside the question of old debts, which can have at present no more than a purely theoretical value, no sensible business man can shut his eyes to the possibilities which are offered by the resumption of normal relations with the Soviet Union.

America is far removed from the Russian republics. The economic significance of the Soviet Union has thus far been little appreciated even by America's most enterprising and far-seeing leaders in business, industry, and politics. The campaign against the resumption of normal relations with the Soviet Union may thus be accounted for. But it is absolutely clear to every one with the most rudimentary knowledge of political and economic conditions that this campaign is only an echo of a remote past as far as Europe is concerned.

The Soviet Union found enough strength to overcome armed intervention and boycott on the part of the Western Powers for seven years, and having been thrown back on its own resources it still had sufficient strength to extricate itself from the state of economic disintegration and to a considerable extent to rehabilitate the country through its own efforts and means. It will continue to do so in the future, recognition or no recognition. Under conditions as they are at present it may be said without any attempt at empty boasting that the longer recognition is delayed by a country the less will be its chance of reaping advantages in the process of reconstruction of the Soviet Union.

In the Driftway

NOT often in the course of a Drifter's serene life is the dust of his desk disturbed by more than the mere echoes of the busy whirl of excitement which is the mainstay of existence to his heavier-minded fellow-beings. But lately he has had an experience and, characteristically, he wants to talk about it. Among the office exchanges which daily rise in mountains of black and white and various shades of yellow came a paper from some far-off village. It was unwrapped, and resting quietly near the crease which ran across the center, lay a small, pale creature known to science and to the well-informed as *Cimex lectularius*. The little insect was greeted with slight screams and every evidence of unfriendliness. He was not, to be sure, much of a cimex. Days of fasting and imprisonment and jolting about in a fourth-class mail bag on the weary journey from Ohio to New York had told upon him, and his frame was gaunt and of a pallor unknown to the Drifter's experience.

* * * * *

LET us hurry to his ultimate disposal. Be it said that it had the virtue of speed, and was altogether lacking in any vulgarity or demonstrations of approval among the staff who were present at the event. The newspaper in which he had made his last journey to this unfriendly bourne was his shroud—the waste-basket his mausoleum. And after all was over and the slight shudders had subsided, the Drifter sat down behind the piled-up exchanges and reflected. What, had there been opportunity for expression, would have been the feelings of the little cimex, betrayed on the hearthstone of this self-styled stronghold of peace among men and beasts—destroyed on the very shrine of charity for all and malice toward none? Well for those that dealt him death that he could speak no warning word. But the Drifter has fears born also of experience. That cimex will rise again. He will rise, phoenix-like, from his waste-basket. He will appear—or some other very like him—and terrorize those sinful hypocrites. He will ride with them in subways, and will walk with them into their offices when they little suspect it. He will haunt their sleeping hours and make of their couches a race course. Let them beware! The cimex has weighed them in the balance, and has found them very badly wanting.

* * * * *

ON the other hand the Drifter has been considering the case of the angle-worm—*Lumbricus terrestris* is what the dictionaries call him—lately the subject of Mr. Heywood Broun's morning moralizing in his newspaper column. Lumbricus has won a glorious victory, and his tribe—so far as Mr. Broun is concerned—may go on increasing until the last trumpet. For Mr. Broun has reached the brave conclusion that it is inhuman for fishermen to bait their hooks with squirming segments of still living wormhood. Of course it is, and the Drifter has nothing but praise for his distinguished fellow-columnist. But Mr. Broun, in his zeal for the comfort of the worm seems to have rather forgotten about the fish. At any rate he dismisses him with a few curt thoughts, which he says he has from other anglers—to the effect that a fish doesn't much mind being caught. Rubbish! Does Mr. Broun think it's a picnic for a fish to swallow a sharp, barbed hook that hacks its way through the walls of its throat? Does he

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

imagine that a fish really likes to be pulled up out of a cool, quiet lake and dangled off the end of a piercing steel while it struggles madly to tear free? Everyone knows that a fish takes things harder than a worm. He is higher in the animal scale and consequently is more sensitive. Two minutes of suffering in a fish's life are worth twenty in a worm's.

* * * * *

BUT the Drifter thinks he understands, and his pleasure in Mr. Broun's altruistic behavior toward the angleworm is a little clouded. For while Mr. Broun says he has discovered three or four foods that are just as delectable and just as efficient as a worm for luring the timid fish, he seems as yet to have found no adequate substitute for the fish itself. THE DRIFTER

Correspondence

La Follette Up to Date

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: I note that William Hard in his article Wisconsin and Socialism omits the fact that Senator La Follette favors public ownership of the nation's water-power and of the transportation systems. How does he reconcile these steps with the enlightened individualism which he says La Follette and La Follette's Wisconsin exemplify? Is Mr. Hard satisfied with Wisconsin as it is today under the reign of what he calls individualism? Is the State University any freer than the University of Chicago or Johns Hopkins? Are public utility rates in Wisconsin cheaper than in Pennsylvania, the home of Penroseism? Were there fewer rapes upon civil liberty in Wisconsin during the war than in Texas or Alabama? Are farmers better off than in Minnesota, the much-bossed State? Or are cooperatives more successful in Wisconsin than in Minnesota? As a resident of both Wisconsin and Minnesota, I answer No.

Besides being a brave and exhilarating figure, Senator La Follette also attracts luster to his name by reshaping a policy of regulation held for thirty years to meet new conditions. Isn't public ownership the best form of regulation of monopoly? It can't be worse than the present inadequate system of commissions.

Minneapolis, Minnesota, August 20 M. H. HEDGES

A "Bigoted Protestant"?

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: While the Democratic convention was in session Governor Smith was reported to have made a plea for religious toleration. That is precisely what the Protestants ask for—to live and let live. They would be highly pleased to have Governor Smith make that plea in Rome, where the Pope is constantly protesting against the presence of Protestants. It would be interesting to see what would happen if he should make the plea in the Vatican.

The great trouble with those who are constantly denouncing "bigoted Protestants" is that they are insincere or have failed to draw a distinction between religion and politics. If there is an indisputable fact of history it is that the Catholic church is a political as well as a religious organization. It is less political today than in former years, not because of any change of heart, but because of the force of circumstances. It has always fought desperately to hold its political power and doubtless would regain it today if it could. The supremacy of the church over the state is a fundamental tenet of Catholicism. Yet when Protestants, who brought about the separation of church and state, seek to oppose the elevation of members of the Catholic church to political power they are denounced as "bigots"!

I am no Klansman. I have no patience with the organization. But those who are denouncing it as an organization based on religious intolerance would do well to draw a distinction between religion and politics. I am a Methodist, yet would vote for a really capable Catholic for public office provided I could be sure that he repudiated the political program of his church, as some of them do. But I will never vote for a Catholic who upholds the political tenets of his church, any more than I would vote for a Methodist who was seeking to use the church as a machine to promote his political ambitions, to say nothing of one running on a platform, secret or avowed, proposing to use the state to promote the interests of the church. If that makes me a "bigoted Protestant," why, in the words of Patrick Henry, "make the most of it."

Fayetteville, Arkansas, August 15 DAVID Y. THOMAS

Child Labor and Congress

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: A child-labor amendment to the Constitution was recently proposed to Congress by a large majority. The amendment provides that "the Congress shall have power to limit, regulate, and prohibit the labor of persons under eighteen years of age." This amendment is unpatriotic, disloyal, and revolutionary. It is revolutionary because no such power has ever before been given to Congress—because it proposes to introduce into the Constitution governmental powers foreign to it, which would deprive the people of the States of local self-government and transfer it, so far as the people of the States are concerned, to foreign hands. Our fathers won by the revolution absolute and complete self-government for the people within the States. They gave up to the Federal Government in the Constitution those powers, and those powers only, which were absolutely necessary to establish and maintain the Federal Government.

Even the Eighteenth Amendment did not give Congress the power to prohibit the manufacture of intoxicating liquors, but declared that they should not be manufactured. We, the whole people, declared a fundamental principle but extended to Congress no additional powers. If our liberties as a people are ever lost, it will be by giving up the principles recognized in the Constitution, which maintains complete local self-government, with sufficient power in the Federal Government for self-preservation and self-government. To say by amendment that persons under eighteen years of age should not be employed in factories employing more than twenty-five persons would follow established plans of amendment and would, perhaps, be no more subject to objection than would be the prohibition or woman-suffrage amendment. But to empower Congress to restrain, regulate, or prohibit is foreign to the purpose of the Constitution.

Minneapolis, Minnesota, July 15 S. R. CHILD

A Campaign Contribution

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: From my address book I have drawn off fifty names. If these persons read *The Nation* for the balance of the year—or at least until election is past—it may make some votes for La Follette and Wheeler and add some names to your subscription list.

I am inclosing a check for $50 and hope you will think it enough to cover the cost—or send as many as possible of these, for as long as you can, for the money.

Minneapolis, August 12 J. W. G.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Look Out!

By EDGAR LEE MASTERS

Gentlemen! You who are statesmen and judges,
Legislators, orators, and makers of political platforms;
Guardians of order and the republic,
Heralds of new civilizations in the name of pure moralities,
Great freedoms, ancient and eternal truths—
All of you serious minded, very able, and well-known artificers
For business, but for clean business, of course;
For justice, as you define it;
For liberty, as you define it—
You, in short, who are running us, and the country,
Don't look down on us the poets, novelists, musicians, and such
Too contemptuously.
Neither let your self-sufficiency ignore us entirely
As mere dreamers, triflers,
Or worse as ungodly frivolers.
For remember! We are busy, we are among you taking notes.
We are radios, cameras, soul chemists,
Testing and distilling you and your vaunted performances.
And now! Can you tell me who was President
When Edgar Allan Poe died in Baltimore,
After certain politicians got him drunk,
And then voted him in every precinct in that city?
What, gentlemen! Is your memory stumped as to one of your very own?
Very well! I will help you!
Zachary Taylor was then President. . . .
Even so! Zachary Taylor, the owner of one hundred slaves
In New Orleans!

Books

The American Manner

The Best Short Stories of 1923. Edited by Edward J. O'Brien. Small, Maynard and Company. $2.

Brothers of No Kin. By Conrad Richter. Hinds, Hayden and Eldridge, Inc.

The Heir. By V. Sackville-West. George H. Doran. $2.

The Elephant Man and Other Reminiscences. By Sir Frederic Treves. Henry Holt and Company. $2.25.

IN comparing Mr. O'Brien's American anthology of short stories with his British collection a reviewer came to the rare and rapid conclusion that it lacked the homogeneity of the latter volume, and as proof he cited the titles, titles breathing of strange, foreign plots and places, which represent the Jewish and German, Irish and Scandinavian, English and half-breed authors. The evidence is revolutionary and overwhelming. Like all great inventions, this simple means of judging the character of books will transform literary criticism even to the extent of disclosing Shakespeare's Italian and Milton's Romano-Hebraic ancestors. Nevertheless, those who would still pursue the old-fashioned method of determining the nationality of a book by reading it will agree that this year Mr. O'Brien's book has an inner unity which most of the previous volumes have lacked and which can be described only by the word, American.

In the first place there is the American manner. Whether in Mr. Stimson's By Due Process of Law, which is written in the dull, lumbering, eighteenth-century style of Charles Brockden Brown and James Kirke Paulding, or in Mr. Adams's Way for a Sailor, which is jotted down with the 1923 post-expression fire and frenzy, there is the smack of American concoction. For in the American tradition a short story is first of all a story; it is comprehensible, self-sustaining, and, above everything else, complete. And it is complete with a finality that extends beyond incident to thought and mood and moral. We are not left with a sentence like Chekhov's "There is no understanding of anything in this world!"; we have no stories without an end; we are not challenged to carry on the problem, to project a character, or to solve the mystery of life. Hence it is of no small significance that, whatever may be the art form in the lands of their forefathers, Sherwood Anderson and Konrad Bercovici, John Cournos and Theodore Dreiser are as much part of this tradition as Irvin Cobb, Solon Stewart, and Harry Leon Wilson. The deduction here is simple: our best work in the short story loses as art what it gains as a social document, and while our writers seldom inspire they almost always inform.

It is, then, of enormous importance that this information is now given honestly and that the social documents have grown trustworthy. No longer can it be said of those authors who are worth discussing at all that, like Martin Eden, they are shuffling the seven standard plots and playing with the wooden puppets of a shopgirl's Elysium; today they are dealing with *genus homo* in all his natural manifestations and in his native haunts. Moreover, there is a further unity of content in the stories of Mr. O'Brien's volume. Be they humorous as Flora and Fauna or rhapsodical as Way for a Sailor; be they evidentiary as the work of Miss Suckow, Mr. Goodwin, and Mr. Dreiser or cynical as the tales of Miss Ferber, Mr. Cobb, and Mr. Cournos; whether mystical as The Man's Story by Mr. Anderson or romantic as Seed by Mr. Bercovici, all these stories are concerned with the study of character in an unpleasant and trying, if not actually antagonistic, environment. They take the measure of an individual as a social being and in doing so depict society as well as paint a portrait. Naturally much of this unanimity is due to the personal preference of Mr. O'Brien, who chose his material from more than a thousand stories, but the fact remains that he was able to gather the greatest contemporary names between the covers of his book.

Beyond doubt My Old Man by Ernest Hemenway, to whom the volume is dedicated, is the finest story of the collection, although Jean Toomer's Blood-Burning Moon and Fannie Hurst's Seven Candles might have challenged this ranking had the latter been less smartly theatrical and the first less frankly imitative of Holiday by Waldo Frank. Mr. Hemenway's portrait is a Rembrandt study, rich of color yet subdued, shadowy in background yet clear in outline. And it releases the creative imagination of the reader in these last sentences:

> "Well Butler got his all right."
> The other guy said, "I don't give a good goddam if he did, the crook. He had it coming to him on the stuff he's pulled."
> "I'll say he had," said the other guy and tore the bunch of tickets in two.
> And George Gardner looked at me to see if I'd heard and I had all right and he said, "Don't you listen to what those bums said, Joe. Your old man was one swell guy."
> But I don't know. Seems like when they get started they don't leave a guy nothing.

Now, Mr. Richter, as his editors have kindly pointed out, "is of German, French, and English blood, and his ancestors fought on both sides of the American Revolution." And the aforementioned reviewer would find his titles—The Laughter of Leen, Bad Luck Is Good Luck, The Sure Thing and Swanson's "Home, Sweet Home"—one hundred per cent American. Yet his stories, praised be the Muses! are no more American than the Ford car. They are a standardized product that is being manufactured and assembled in every corner of the earth and they appeal equally well to the bourgeoisie of all nations. What pale slavey doesn't dream that the locomotive engineer will blow "Home, Sweet Home" for her; what pimpled bank clerk doesn't imagine himself a hero to his president; what green grocer

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

wouldn't marry a golden-haired maiden who laughed while her heart was breaking?

The tales of Miss Sackville-West, infinitely more suave, subtle, and civilized in execution, are perilously near that standardized quality in conception. To be sure, in Patience she not only rises above the international Richters, but also above most of the work in the O'Brien volume; but that story is her own high mark which the others do not begin to approach. They are too obvious. Her denouements can always be anticipated and her skilful writing is not sufficiently opaque to hide the machinery of plot.

It is the machinery of plot that mars the narrative of Sir Treves. These incidents taken out of a surgeon's case-book offered an unequaled opportunity to portray life in the raw, and the writer muffed it. With the exception of The Old Receiving Room, which is like a battle scene of Delacroix in its frank, repellent beauty, the author's subjects are the unusual slices of life that are false to life because they have a beginning, a middle, and a logical end. As such, they fall into the class of commonplace fiction—banal, sentimental, and dull.

JOHAN J. SMERTENKO

Artifice

The Tattooed Countess. By Carl Van Vechten. Alfred A. Knopf. $2.50.

THERE is a kind of romance, midway between sentiment and cynicism, which no American has ever yet written well. In stories of true love we have long been at home, and lately we have come to treat the drama of illegitimate passion without the more obvious sort of moralizing. But the latter is still, with us, a matter too serious for sentiment, and we are still too little familiar with it as an accepted social institution to take it lightly. It must be great and overwhelming before it can justify itself in our eyes, and though we have got to the point where we can read and admire Schnitzler, for example, his spirit is still too strange for us successfully to imitate him. We cannot, as he can, find in loves which are merely light a graceful charm; nor do we catch, as he does, from unions which are merely passing, half mercenary and half mocking, a delicate and wistful fragrance. Passing as we just have from the age of innocence into the first excitement of disillusion we still look for great passions, legitimate or illegitimate, and we have not come yet to the point where, like some of the older, wearier peoples, we can accept sex and gallantry which are veiled only by exquisite manners as the most that man can well expect and as having in their own consciousness of their incompleteness a wistful charm.

It is this fact, perhaps, which explains the comparative failure of "The Tattooed Countess." Mr. Van Vechten has wished, I think, to write a completely sophisticated novel, and he has certainly chosen a completely sophisticated plot, telling of an American countess who leaves Paris in middle age and returns to her native village in Iowa in the hope of forgetting there a love affair with a provincial opera singer. When she, snatching at love once more as her youth ends, becomes passionately enamored of a village boy, and when he, not because he fails to realize the temporary nature of his love but because he sees in her an escape, runs away with her to Paris, Mr. Van Vechten means that we shall see these actions not as mean but as wise. And so, indeed, Schnitzler could make them appear. George Moore, too, might make these people human and real, but Mr. Van Vechten is, in spite of all his efforts, not European enough, and try as he will he cannot, except at moments, vivify his people. In spite of all his grace of style and his wit the book is hardly more than a very clever stunt, an effort to capture a spirit which the author admires, but which he has learned instead of finding bred in his bones.

Various defects might be pointed out. It might be remarked, for example, that the author's knowledge of the world is too obviously paraded, that many tricks of style, including the use of strange words like "sciapodous" and "egrimoncy," give sometimes the impression of intolerable preciosity, and that the solemn references to fashionable places and things amount sometimes to snobbery. But most serious of all, perhaps, is the fact that, like nearly all Americans who are "advanced" in their literary ideas, Mr. Van Vechten suffers from the Main Street complex. Having brought the countess and the boy together he cannot resist the impulse to do a thing absolutely fatal to the non-moral romance, namely, to attempt to justify them. He must prove, what no thorough sophisticate would dream of thinking worth his while, that the life of the village is narrow, bigoted, and morally worse than the great world, and as a result we are treated to one more description of the sewing circle and the gossip party, the speech of the booster and the pronunciamentos of the villagers on the subject of art. The result is a mixture of styles which not even Mr. Van Vechten's skill can hold together. Indeed it is not difficult to detect three manners and to suspect that the mood of the book changed as the author wrote it. The fantastic title seems to belong to the opening portion, which is written in the style of rather extravagant satire; next comes the homely realism of the Gopher Prairie school of fiction, and finally the drama of disillusioned passion.

In spite of the fact that there are not infrequent passages of wit and that, as a whole, the book is amusing reading, it remains one which obviously did not grow but was made, and its artificial character is revealed by many things, including, for example, the rather clumsy documentation which leads the author to mention, one would guess, at least two hundred names of books, authors, pictures, etc., and to rely to a preposterous extent upon the opinions of his persons upon works of art to illustrate their characters. He has proposed to himself the writing of a certain kind of novel, highly sophisticated and stylistically elaborate, but the essentially literary character of his inspiration is evident in almost every line, and he has produced a book which seems constantly more in contact with other books than with life. Mr. Van Vechten wishes more than anything else not to be a moralist, and yet there is no emotion or opinion in all the novel which seems quite so personal and deep-rooted as his moral indignation against the village.

J. W. KRUTCH

An Amateur at Literature

Critical Ventures in Modern French Literature. By Arnold Whitridge. Charles Scribner's Sons. $1.75.

A RATHER skimped volume of literary criticism, "padded out" by all the expedients of spacing, margining, and thick paper known to the printing trade, with a title at once banal and misleading, selling at half the price usually assessed for such a work, and containing the opinions of a gentleman wholly unknown at least to one reader on nine French writers, only three of whom can be regarded as talents of the first order, is not a bait likely to arouse the reviewer to a high pitch of excitement. But when one discovers in such an unpromising setting the most sympathetic and illuminating paper he has ever encountered on so generally misunderstood and maligned a character as Sainte-Beuve, one may be forgiven a certain thrill of discovery.

I suspect Mr. Whitridge of being an amateur at literature. At least, though certain of these essays appear to have been published in periodicals before their presentation in a book, they were quite obviously not written with the primary purpose of sale; and they possess a freshness of touch, an intimacy of realization, an absence of literary subterfuge and critical *cliché*, and a leisured enjoyment in the writing that is not common in the literary profession, as literature is practiced in this ambitious generation. Charles Lamb was such an amateur; Michel de Montaigne was another; and Lorenzo de' Medici was

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the prince of them. It is to such talented amateurs that we owe the survival of our arts through many a difficult period.

Mr. Whitridge has, as I have observed, written an essay on Sainte-Beuve that is both delightful and instructive. It is also especially notable for the tact with which he disposes of the question of the French critic's unfortunate infatuation for Madame Hugo and his subsequent bad taste in publishing a highly romantic account of it to the world in his volume of poems, "Livre d'Amour," and his novel, "Volupté." The essay on Anatole France, in which the great master is portrayed, not as an ironical Aristophanes, but as a kindly old gentleman with a vast human sympathy and an almost sentimental regard for literature, is similarly engaging, by reason of the same cardinal virtues of understanding and tact. Mr. Whitridge is not so much concerned with the written word as he is with the man; and he cares not at all what might be his "place" in literature. The result is a satisfying and pervading charm.

The essay on Stendhal is interesting, but not notable; I take it that Mr. Whitridge has caught himself nodding over "Rouge et Noir" and is honest enough to confess it. Gerard de Nerval, the eccentric "sanitist," who took his own life that he might discover what passes beyond the veil, proves a more happy choice. Barbey de Aurevilly and Villiers de l'Isle-Adam, both dandies and both unquenchable romantics, also provide him attractive subjects for this intimate and sensitive criticism. His choice of Marie Lenéru among the figures of our own time is almost as felicitous; and the paper on Sacha Guitry is the only one in the book that one feels ought not to have been preserved.

WILLIAM A. DRAKE

Down to the Sea in Ships

Before the Mast and After: The Autobiography of a Sailor and Shipowner. By Sir Walter Runciman. Charles E. Lauriat Company. $4.50.

THIS is a delightful human narrative of irresistible attraction for all who love the sea as well as true stories of adventure and daring. Walter Runciman, grandson of a veteran of Nelson's fleet, son of a ship's captain, ran away to sea at twelve and rose to the command of ships at as early an age as did Marryat's heroes one and all. When the end of the sailing era came Runciman switched over to steamers, and after some very fortunate years as captain and manager laid down his command because of ill-health and went ashore to begin a phenomenally successful career as owner of steamers which won him wealth, fame, a "handle to his name," and great political and business influence—he sat in Parliament with his only son, the Right Honorable Walter Runciman, member of several Liberal governments. No romance written of nineteenth-century sea conditions ever had more stirring material. But that is not all. Every American who is concerned with the problem of building an American merchant fleet ought to read this volume because it explains better than all the dry treatises on the rise of the British merchant sea-power how English sailors won and have kept their mastery of the sea. It ought among other things to make Americans realize that the training of craftsmen to navigate and handle a fleet both as sailors and owners is even more important than the building of a fleet.

Sir Walter himself appears in this volume as an interesting mixture of an advanced liberal and a conservative. Against the Russians and Socialists and all who "whine" about the bad social conditions he rages in true big-business manner. As one who rose from the forecastle he rather glories in the old and brutal methods of managing crews—at least he half defends them, though he is careful to set the seal of his emphatic disapproval upon the methods used on Yankee ships, which, to our shame be it said, have given American captains and mates the reputation of being the most brutal and murderous of any who ever sailed the seas. On the other hand, Sir Walter appears as the ardent champion of Havelock Wilson, the militant head of the Seamen's and Firemen's Union, to combat which the Shipping Federation was formed. As is so often the case, the owners fought Wilson without getting to know him or understand him. Sir Walter did both, came to like and respect him, and even, to the horror of his associates in the business, presided at one of Wilson's meetings. In this, too, there is a valuable lesson for American shipowners. It is significant, also, that Sir Walter admits that not one single reform of the many that have been achieved in the fight to transform the forecastle into something better than a floating hell came from within the trade, but in each instance was forced by rank outsiders who had, with one exception, never been to sea. This should interest those who believe that human institutions, political, social, and economic, can only, or can best, be reformed from within.

Finally, if Sir Walter writes with much naivete and complete appreciation of his success in life, he nevertheless gives a portrait of a fine type of man who succeeded by his own merit, and he proves anew that neither the day of steam nor of the Diesel engine can rob the sea of that romance which will inure to it just as long as men go down to it in ships, whatever their size or shape or methods of propulsion.

OSWALD GARRISON VILLARD

Books in Brief

The Principles of Journalism. By Casper S. Yost. D. Appleton and Company. $1.50.

An innocuous volume by the president of the American Society of Newspaper Editors which adds nothing to the existing literature on journalism and is devoid of any new or striking thought. Cautious throughout, it deals in generalities where the specific issues which confront the journalist today might to good advantage have been discussed. It should get a handsome reception from the daily press.

Love Days. By Henrie Waste. Alfred A. Knopf. $3.

The story of Suzanna Moore's "love days" is the tale of a woman's search for the ideal man; and it is a work of pure imagination. Promenading her characters through various cities of the world, the author seems to have had multiple points of contact with life, but no points of penetration or comprehension. We are familiar enough with the conscious revolt against realism; but this book is apparently an unconscious revolt; experience and fact are shaped to fit some a priori conception of existence, and the result is pure fantasy produced in accordance with precise realistic methods. As to the mental processes revealed in the book, Turro stated the case quite neatly when he said to Suzanna, "when you are theoretical you are a little too naive to be quite bearable." And Suzanna herself perceived something of the truth when she confided in Ewart that she was like a country with a highly internal development but without any foreign policy, "quite without any conception of one's relation to the outside world. . . ." The heroine is not the only character in the book who furnishes uninterrupted amusement to the reader; and we should, perhaps, thank the author for this. "But then," as Professor Saintsbury has put it, "the farce must be in life conceivable and in literature conscious."

I'll Show You the Town. By Elmer Davis. Robert M. MacBride and Company. $2.

An hilarious story for the tired business man's vacation. Innocent, impressionable heiresses are so gloriously abundant that they fairly clutter up the sidewalks. Male rivals are correspondingly scarce. The only depressing passages are those in which the bachelor reader bitterly realizes how little resemblance the story has to actual life. Entertaining as the book is, it would have been uproarious perfection itself had it been condensed to two-thirds of its present length.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

International Relations Section

The Anglo-Russian Treaty

IN this issue and the next we print the most interesting sections of the treaties recently signed at London by representatives of the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics and of the British Government. In doing so we omit for reasons of space chapters I and II, which cover the following points: treaties recognized by the two parties as having lost their force, treaties regarded as still in force, multilateral treaties to be applied in the future as between the two parties, provisions regulating fisheries in water contiguous to the northern coasts of the Soviet Union. In our next issue will appear the text of the trade agreement which forms a part of the general treaty. The plenipotentiaries signing the treaty were

For Great Britain and Northern Ireland:

The Right Honorable JAMES RAMSAY MACDONALD, M.P., First Lord of the Treasury and Prime Minister, Principal Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs;

Mr. ARTHUR AUGUSTUS WILLIAM HARRY PONSONBY, M.P., Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs;

For the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics:

CHRISTIAN GEORGIEVICH RAKOVSKI, member of the Presidium of the Central Executive Committee of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Deputy People's Commissar for Foreign Affairs, Chargé d'Affaires in London of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics;

ADOLPH ABRAMOVICH JOFFE, member of the Central Executive Committee of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics;

ANDREI FEDOROVICH RADCHENKO, member of the Central Executive Committee of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, president of the Provincial Council of Trade Unions of the Donetz Basin;

ARON LVOVICH SCHEINMANN, member of the Collegium of the People's Commissariat of Finance;

MIKHAIL PAVLOVICH TOMSKI, member of the Presidium of the Central Executive Committee of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, president of the All-Russian Central Council of Trade Unions.

CHAPTER III. CLAIMS AND LOAN

ART. 6. In pursuance of the declaration annexed to the trade agreement of March 16, 1921, the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics declares that by way of exception to the decree of January 28, 1918 (concerning the annulment of debts of the former Imperial and Provisional governments), it will satisfy, in the conditions prescribed in the present treaty, the claims of British holders of loans issued or taken over or guaranteed by the former Imperial Russian Government, or by the municipalities of towns in the territory now included in the Union, payable in foreign (non-Russian) currency.

The Government of His Britannic Majesty recognizes that the financial and economic position of the Union renders impracticable the full satisfaction of the claims referred to in the preceding paragraph of this article.

The Government of the Union agrees to meet the claims referred to in the first paragraph of this article in respect of holdings by British subjects or companies other than holdings which were acquired by purchase since March 16, 1921, and were in other than British ownership on that date.

After negotiation between the parties concerned, the terms on which the claims referred to in the first paragraph of this article shall be satisfied will form the subject of an agreement with His Britannic Majesty's Government, which will be included in the treaty referred to in Article 11, provided that His Britannic Majesty's Government is satisfied that such terms have been accepted by the holders of not less than one-half of the capital values of British holdings in the loans referred to in this article.

ART. 7. All questions connected with the claims of the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics against the Government of His Britannic Majesty, or with the claims of the Government of His Britannic Majesty against the Government of the Union, arising out of events which took place between August 4, 1914, and February 1, 1924, are reserved for discussion at a later date. This provision includes claims in respect of:

(a) War loans advanced by the Government of His Britannic Majesty to the former Russian Imperial or Provisional governments;

(b) Gold belonging to the former Russian Imperial or Provisional governments, and handed over to the Government of His Britannic Majesty by either of those governments;

(c) Russian gold handed over to Germany under the supplementary agreement to the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk;

(d) Sums owed by the former Russian Imperial or Provisional governments to British Government departments, or vice versa;

(e) The claims advanced by the Government of the Union on the ground of intervention between November 7, 1917, and March 16, 1921; and also any adjustments made or to be made in the accounts relating to such claims on either side.

There shall similarly be reserved all questions connected with claims by the nationals of either party against the other party, in respect of loss or damage suffered in the territory of the party whose national the claimant is, and resulting from warlike operations or hostile measures during the above-mentioned period.

ART. 8. Claims by nationals (including juridical persons) of the one party against the other party in respect of loss or injury due to events which took place between August, 1914, and the coming into force of the present treaty, other than (1) claims covered by other articles of the present treaty, and (2) claims arising out of normal trading relations between the Government of the Russian Socialist Federative Soviet Republic or governments allied to or federated with it, or its agents, and British nationals, or between the Government of His Britannic Majesty and citizens of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, shall, in view of the admitted preponderance of the claims of British nationals, be finally settled as between the contracting parties by the payment of a lump sum by the Government of the Union to the Government of His Britannic Majesty.

The distribution of this sum shall be effected by the Government of His Britannic Majesty in such manner as they shall consider just. The Government of the Union undertakes to furnish the Government of His Britannic Majesty with any relevant papers or information in their possession which may facilitate the just distribution of such sum.

ART. 9. Each of the contracting parties shall appoint three properly qualified persons to examine the claims of which the settlement is to be effected by the payment of the lump sum provided for in Article 8. These six persons shall make a joint examination of the claims, and shall report to the two contracting parties the amount at which they consider the lump sum should be fixed. If they are unable to agree as to the amount of the lump sum, they shall present separate reports. They will arrange their own procedure, and shall, in particular, be entitled by agreement between themselves to refer the examination of any particular category of claims to two of their number.

Each of the contracting parties shall defray the remuneration and expenses of the persons appointed by it, together with one-half of the expenses incurred jointly.

ART. 10. Being desirous of reestablishing the economic cooperation between their two countries, the Government of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

His Britannic Majesty and the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics agree as follows:

The Government of the Union will, by way of exception to the decrees nationalizing industrial businesses and land, negotiate with British nationals (including juridical persons) in respect of industrial businesses or concessions which have been nationalized or canceled by it, in order to arrange for the grant of just compensation for such claims.

Furthermore a commission shall be appointed to examine the validity and ascertain the amount of the claims.

Each of the contracting parties agrees to assist the commission so far as possible with regard to supplying or collecting papers or information required for the proper accomplishment of its task.

If the members of the commission are unable to agree on a joint report in respect of any particular property, they may present separate reports.

In cases where the Government of the Union concludes an agreement with an individual claimant, the commission shall be informed of such agreement in order that the claim in question may be withdrawn from the competence of the commission.

The commission shall consist of six persons possessing the necessary qualifications for their task, three being appointed by the Government of His Britannic Majesty and three by the Government of the Union.

The commission shall settle its own procedure, which shall be approved by the two governments. Each of the contracting parties shall defray the remuneration and pay the expenses of the persons appointed by it, together with one-half of the expenses incurred jointly.

ART. 11. A second treaty will be entered into which will contain:

1. The conditions accepted in accordance with Article 6.
2. The amount and method of payment of compensation for claims under Article 8.
3. An agreed settlement of property claims other than those directly settled by the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

ART. 12. Upon the signature of the treaty referred to in Article 11 His Britannic Majesty's Government will recommend Parliament to enable them to guarantee the interest and sinking fund of a loan to be issued by the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

The amount, terms, and conditions of the said loan and the purposes to which it shall be applied shall be defined in the treaty provided for in Article 11, which will not come into force until the necessary parliamentary authority for the guaranty of the said loan has been given.

ART. 13. The provisions of this chapter constitute a single and indivisible unit.

CHAPTER IV. MISCELLANEOUS

ART. 14. On the coming into force of the treaty referred to in Article 11, Article 10 of the Trade Agreement of March 16, 1921, will be abrogated, until which time it will be maintained in force, Article 1 of the present treaty notwithstanding.

ART. 15. Documents and papers of every kind, which on November 1, 1917, belonged to individual subjects or citizens of either party, and are now withheld from the owners and are in the possession or under the control of the Government or a public institution of the other party, shall be returned to the owners, or to such representative as they may appoint, within two months from the date of a request to that effect.

ART. 16. The contracting parties solemnly affirm their desire and intention to live in peace and amity with each other, scrupulously to respect the undoubted right of a state to order its own life within its own jurisdiction in its own way, to refrain and to restrain all persons and organizations under their direct or indirect control, including organizations in receipt of any financial assistance from them, from any act, overt or covert, liable in any way whatsoever to endanger the tran-

ANDORRA

CALLED by Robert Morss Lovett in the New Republic

"A beautiful book, a worthy addition to that line of French fiction from Colomba to Maria Chapdelaine in which the passion of romance is subdued to classic dignity and grace, and in which nature forms a noble and enduring background to the heroic quality of mankind."

By the Philadelphia Record

"A masterpiece . . . a really great book."

By the Milwaukee Sentinel

"Harmonious as noble music."

From the French of Isabelle Sandy

TOUT BIEN OU RIEN

Houghton Mifflin Co. Illus. $2.00

What La Follette's State Is Doing

By CHESTER C. PLATT of Madison, Wis.

One reviewer has called this book a sequel to Dr. Frederic C. Howe's "Wisconsin, An Experiment in Democracy." It is not a campaign book, and when written the author did not know whether La Follette would be a candidate for president or not. The object of the book is to show that Wisconsin liberals, imbued with the La Follette spirit, have made this state one of the best governed in the union, and the progressive reforms adopted here have promoted and not hindered the commercial prosperity of the state.

Here are the titles of some of the chapters. Part Time Schools, Unemployment Insurance, University Extension, The Legal Status of Women, Cooperative Movements, Public Ownership, Taxing Unearned Incomes.

The volume contains over 300 pages. Has been carefully indexed and is illustrated with portraits of many Wisconsin progressives. Price $2.50. Order through your bookseller, or by mail of the publishers, Batavia Times Press, Batavia, N. Y.

For descriptive circulars address
CHESTER C. PLATT, 119 W. Main Street, Madison, Wis.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

quillity or prosperity of any part of the territory of the British Empire or the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics or intended to embitter the relations of the British Empire or the Union with their neighbors or any other countries. . . .

ART. 17. The present treaty is drawn up and signed in the English language. A translation shall be made into the Russian language as soon as possible and agreed between the parties. Both texts shall then be considered authentic for all purposes.

ART. 18. The present treaty shall be ratified, and the ratifications shall be exchanged in London as soon as possible.

In witness whereof the respective plenipotentiaries have signed the present treaty and have affixed thereto their seals.

Russia's Harvest

REPORTS of bad crops and famine conditions in various parts of Russia have been widely published. The following official statement of the situation and of the means taken to combat it appeared in a recent issue of *Pravda* (Moscow). It was written by G. Zinoviev.

The gross figures for this year's harvest will probably amount to not much under 2,600,000 poods, in other words, they will not be much behind those of the previous year's harvest. Nevertheless, it is already evident that the failure of the crops this year has affected a number of provinces more seriously than was at first thought to be the case.

Agriculture has for a long time formed the basis of the whole of our economy. Hence the recent crop failure means a severe blow to the whole economic organism of the Soviet Union. The purchasing power of the peasantry, taken as a whole, however, will probably not be less than it was last year. It is therefore harmful, and in any case premature, to speak of any reduction in the plans of production of our state industries.

There is no doubt, however, that the rate of economic revival this year will not correspond with our earlier expectations. . . . The bad harvest of 1924 confronts us with many new difficulties. Doubtless the catastrophe is not as bad as that of 1921. It cannot be denied that since that time we have greatly increased in economic strength. . . . We have, however, no reason either to remain idle and inactive or to indulge in self-deception. . . .

We talk a good deal of our alliance with the peasantry. Now is the time to realize this alliance through a task which touches the peasants very closely. A friend in need is a friend indeed. The peasantry needs our help precisely now when a relatively little help can rescue whole sections of the peasantry from ruin. . . .

The party must now show the peasants, not with words but by deeds, that it is supporting them in every possible way. The state organs which are under the leadership of the party must prove to the peasants by deeds that the workers' and peasants' state, during the time of need, hastened to help agriculture with all the means at its disposal.

We have already adopted serious measures with regard to providing seed; we must increase our efforts in this direction.

The measures which the government commission, over which Comrade Rykov presides, has adopted must be brought to the knowledge of the peasants.

The granting of agricultural credits is now, in view of the failure of crops, assuming greater importance. The same applies to the agricultural cooperatives and still more to every kind of agronomic help and propaganda. . . .

In order to combat the consequences of the drought, a large-scale program, extending over ten years, for the improvement of the soil has been worked out. . . .

The workers of the largest industrial centers must take, under their patronage the districts most seriously affected by the drought. . . .

The New School
for Social Research

PURPOSE: To seek an unbiased understanding of the existing order, its genesis, growth and present working, as well as of those circumstances which are making for its revision.

Registration begins September 29
School Year begins October 6

JOHN B. WATSON—Behavior Psychology.
Thursday, 8.20—9.50 P. M.

FRANKWOOD E. WILLIAMS—Mental Hygiene.
Monday, 8.20—9.50 P. M.

DOUGLAS A. THOM—Habit Training in Children.
Friday, 8.20—9.50 P. M.

BERNARD GLUECK—Mental Hygiene Problems of Childhood.
Thursday, 5.20—6.50 P. M.

HARRY A. OVERSTREET—The Technique of Influencing Human Behavior.
Tuesday, 8.20—9.50 P. M.

EVERETT DEAN MARTIN—Introduction to Social Psychology.
Wednesday, 8.20—9.50 P. M.

WILLIAM I. THOMAS—Personality Development.
Friday, 8.20—9.50 P. M.

HORACE M. KALLEN—Dominant Ideals of Western Civilization.
Tuesday, 8.20—9.50 P. M.

A. A. GOLDENWEISER—Theories of Evolution and Progress from Herbert Spencer to Bertrand Russell.
Monday, 5.20—6.50 P. M.

DAVID FRIDAY—Principles of Political Economy.
Wednesday, 8.20—9.50 P. M.

LEO WOLMAN—The Labor Movement in the National Life.
Monday, 8.20—9.50 P. M.

FREDERICK R. MACAULAY — Statistical Method.
Thursday, 8.20—9.50 P. M.

JOSEPH K. HART—Theory and Practice in "New Schools."
Friday, 5.20—6.50 P. M.

STARK YOUNG—The Art of the Theatre.
Tuesday, 5.20—6.50 P. M.

H. W. L. DANA—Twentieth Century Literature.
Friday, 8.20—9.50 P. M.

Tuition for each course of eighteen lectures, $20.

Write for catalogue to
465 West 23d Street **New York City**

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In addition to our People's Commissariat for Agriculture, the other people's commissariats must bestir themselves and adapt the whole of their work to the situation among the peasants. . . .

For some time past many of our organizations, as, for example, the recent congress of our Youth League, have paid greater attention to the village. This of course does not only refer to organizations which are situated in the agricultural districts, but also to the capitals and other big proletarian centers.

"We have such and such a number of model institutions in this or that town," reports this or the other authority. To this our party must answer: "Yes, but what have you done for the village? Pay attention to the village, think of the peasantry. We are a land of workers and peasants."

The road of the proletarian revolution is not strewn with roses. New difficulties are unavoidable in the course of the complete economic reconstruction of the country. These difficulties are to be overcome and we shall surmount all emergencies only if we succeed this time in rousing to organized work the millions of workers who follow our party.

The working class and the peasantry of our republics are knit together by indissoluble bonds. During the whole revolution the working class of our country exercised a powerful influence upon the peasantry. We must not forget, however, that during the past seven years we have sometimes seen the contrary: the mood of the peasantry has penetrated by a thousand ways into the circles of city workers and found an echo in the factories and workshops, and on more than one occasion created very serious political difficulties. This will be the case now also if the party and the working class do not put forward all their efforts. . . .

As a Doctor Sees It. By Dr. B. LIBER. 173 stories from the intimate life of all kinds of people. Illustrated with 64 pencil sketches by the author.—Seven Parts:—Part I. *"In the Sweat of Thy Face"* contains stories from the life of the WORKING PEOPLE; Part II. *"Poisoned Pleasure"* deals with SEX LIFE AND BIRTH CONTROL; Part III. *"Pain and Sorrow"* speaks about *sad situations* in life as the doctor meets them; Part IV. *"War Echoes"* shows the disastrous EFFECTS OF THE WAR among the common people; Part V. *"Life Waves"* gives a number of unusually interesting pictures and problems; Part VI. *"Shop Gossip"* is what its title implies, gossip about things of which doctors prefer to talk among themselves; and Part VII. *"Between Consultations"* takes the doctor away from his work for a while and makes him see other things, but always from the doctor's point of view.

Received as a revelation by the press: A frank volume, frankly illustrated. It should be particularly called to the attention of comfortable people.—*N. Y. Sun.* Extremely colorful and fascinating.—*Fourth Estate.* Human documents. Reveal the need of more and better social service work.—*Boston Evening Transcript.* Some are sordid, others tragic, some gay, all real and impressive.—*Industrial Pioneer.* Admirable book. Brevity and ease gracefully combined in this portrayal of the humorous and the pathetic. Thought-provoking.—*Truth-Seeker.* Intensely interesting.—*Kansas City Star.* Mass of important facts told with first-class literary skill—*Upton Sinclair.* I wish everyone of the 534 members of Congress had to read your book—*Mary Ware Dennett,* Director, Voluntary Parenthood League. Clever and entertaining—*Atlanta Constitution.* It is the blatant reality and tragic death-in-life that a doctor of the city poor has to encounter.—*San Francisco Chronicle.* Intensely interesting and full of keen clinical and human observation. I compliment you upon your glimpse into people's character and their mode of living.—*Haven Emerson, M.D.* Absorbingly interesting.—*London Spectator.* Impressionistic dabs of many phases of life among the lowly of a huge city. Close powers of observation, adroit selection of words and artistic use of pencil serve to fasten these mental snapshots vividly in mind.—*N. Y. Medical Week.* One is struck with the author's sincerity. Excellent pencil sketches.—*N. Y. Evening Post.* Remarkable book by a remarkable personality. The author is an artist in drawing human forms.—*Freiheit.* A rare book. Shows life honestly and frankly.—*St. Louis Post Dispatch.* Wonderfully fertile.—*Seattle Post Intelligencer.* Most unique book, revealing inside picture of a doctor's life. Brave, courageous.—*Vegetarian Magazine.*

THE CHILD AND THE HOME, by Dr. B. Liber. Second, enlarged edition. Most modern ideas on the bringing-up of children. Common Errors, Practical Advice, Instances from Life, Sex, Health and Food Problems.—320 *pages; cloth,* $2.50; *paper,* $1.50.

RATIONAL LIVING, an illustrated monthly devoted to health conservation and exposing dishonesty in all healing professions, B. Liber, M. D., Dr. P. H., editor.—August issue out: A Vacation, Labor and Health, Posture at Work, The Healers, a medical novel, Diet of World's Workers, Child Care, Examinations, Normal Sex Life, Exercise, Cancer, Etc.—40c. a copy. —*Regular subscription,* $2.00.

Subscr. to R. L. and copy of "As a Doctor Sees it," $3.50.

Subscr. to R. L. and copy of "The Child and the Home," cloth, $4.00; *paper,* $3.00.

Subscr. to R. L. and copies of both books, $5.50 *or* $4.50.

Address: RATIONAL LIVING, 61 Hamilton Pl., New York.

IN ATHENS 400 B.C.

DIOGENES

Had No Housing Problem:

The Upkeep of His Lantern Was His Only Expense.

IN NEW YORK 1924 A. D.

It Is Not So Simple But

CO-OPERATIVE HOME-OWNERSHIP

Will Reduce Your Rent Burden to Cost of Upkeep

The Bedford Barrow Co-operative Apartments

in Greenwich Village

are genuine, non-profit co-operatives.

Thirty-five apartments, 4, 5 and 6 rooms

Initial Investment $1,230 to $2,400.

Monthly Charges $50 to $100 (approx.) (Including mortgage payments)

Each year the net monthly charges decrease

The member's investment increases

Write for Information to:—

Consumers' Co-operative Housing Association, Inc

70 Fifth Ave. Room 411 Chelsea 0432

Pres. Cedric Long 1st Vice-Pres. Franklin C. Wells, Jr.
Sec'y Harry Rappaport 2nd Vice-Pres. Helen L. Alfred
Treas. Adolph Wirkkula

Affiliated with

THE CO-OPERATIVE LEAGUE OF THE U. S. A.

WANTED: Protestant family of good character to adopt an eight-months-old, healthy and unusually attractive boy of fine heredity. Matter in charge of high-grade child-caring agency. Applications around southeastern Pennsylvania preferred. Apply to Box 234, care of The Nation, giving full details.

MAMUMIT SCHOOL, Pawling, Dutchess Co., New York

A Modern Community Boarding School for the Children of Workers—Boys and Girls 9 to 14 years. Can take three more girls and two more boys at a tuition charge which covers actual cost.

Arthur Warner's three articles on

La Follette's Record

have been reprinted in pamphlet form and can be ordered from

The Nation

20 Vesey Street
New York

10 cents a copy
$5.00 a hundred
$30.00 a thousand

When writing to advertisers, please mention The Nation

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED